

THE GURJARA-PRATĪHĀRAS AND THEIR TIMES

THE GURJARA-PRATĪHĀRAS AND THEIR TIMES

BY

VIBHUTI BHUSHAN MISHRA, *M.A.*,
Reader, Post-Graduate Department of History,
Gauhati University (Assam)

1966

S. CHAND & CO.

DELHI—NEW DELHI—JULLUNDUR—LUCKNOW
BOMBAY — CALCUTTA — MADRAS

S. CHAND & CO.

Ram Nagar	— NEW DELHI
Fountain	— DELHI
Mai Hiran Gate	— JULLUNDUR
Aminabad Park	— LUCKNOW
167, Lamington Road	— BOMBAY
32, Ganesh Chandra Ave.	— CALCUTTA
35, Mount Road	— MADRAS

Price : Rs. 12·50

Published by S. Chand & Co., Ram Nagar New Delhi-1 and printed at Rajendra Printers, Ram Nagar, New Delhi-1.

To my parents

Pandit Hari Mohan Mishra

and

Shrimati Annapurna Mishra

PREFACE

The monograph is a study of an important dynasty of Northern India which played a striking role on the political and cultural stage of India during the early mediaeval period. The Gurjara-Pratihāras, whose history has been essayed in the following pages, rose to prominence in the second half of the sixth century A.D. In the fluid political condition of the North, they started moving towards other directions from their original home in Gurjaratrā in the modern State of Rajasthan. A branch of the Gurjara-Pratihāras established itself at Bhṛgukaccha (Broach) under the command of Dadda I. Another branch advanced towards Mālava and occupied Avanti, the cock-pit of the time, round about the fourth decade of the eighth century A.D. The Gurjara-Pratihāras of Mālava entered the political arena to seize the imperial city of Kānyakubja. Their efforts were crowned with success during the reign of Nāgabhaṭa II. The glory of Kānyakubja was revived under the wings of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras and once more it became the citadel of politics and culture. Many a ruling dynasty of the North acknowledged the suzerainty of the imperial house at Kānyakubja. In the palmy days, the Pratihāra empire touched the foot of the Himalayas in the north and extended up to the Karnal district of the Punjab in the north-west. In the south, Bundelkhand was a part of the empire and even the Candellas continued to acknowledge their suzerainty till 954 A.D. In the east Magadha and the northern part of the Rajshahi district of undivided Bengal were annexed to the Pratihāra dominions. In the west Saurāṣṭra was under their sway and the Narmadā formed the south-western boundary of their territories. Their history is marked with the struggle with the Pālas of Gauḍa and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa. The days of Pratihāra glory ended with the death of Mahīpāla I. The second half of the tenth century A.D. is the history of the disintegration of the empire. The feudatories became virtually independent and the rulers at Kānyakubja failed to assert their power. The empire which

was tottering to its fall, crumbled to pieces with the invasion of Mahmūd of Ghaznī. The history of Kānyakubja passed in the limbo of darkness till the rise of the Gahaḍavālas in the last decade of the eleventh century A.D.

The study of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras and their times is based on the examination of the original sources, *viz.*, epigraphs of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras as well as the epigraphic records of the contemporary dynasties, the accounts of the Arab travellers and the Prākṛt and Sanskṛt literature of the time. The epigraphs facilitate the study of the administrative and cultural condition of India during the early mediaeval period in addition to genealogies. They throw light on the titles of the state functionaries, the administrative departments, the administrative units in which the country was parcelled, the land grants, occasions for making such grants, the nature of grants, the name of the donees, the trade transactions, the guilds, the taxes and the coins in use.

The accounts of the contemporary Muslim travellers yield valuable information to piece together the social and religious life of the people. Among the Muslim travellers whose observations help build the administrative and cultural history of the period are Sulaimān, Ibn Khurdādba, Al Mas'ūdi, Al Utbī, Alberūnī and Al Idrīsī. I am, in particular, indebted to Sachau for his translation of Alberūnī's work, Tahkīk-i-Hind. Alberūnī's work is a mine of information with regard to the varied fields of human activity. His references to astrology and astronomy, dispensation of justice, organisation of society, social intercourse, customs and manners, religious practices etc. present a colourful picture of the society. It is hard to believe that any study of the period can be complete without copious references to the accounts of Alberūnī.

Another source of information is the Prākṛt and Sanskṛt literature. Śaṅkara's *bhāṣyas*, Rājaśekhara's works and Somadeva's *Yaśastilaka* give an insight into the prevailing features of culture. Buddhism and Jainism were no more the vigorous religious movements but the country was diving deep into metaphysical concepts. Schools of thought had taken root in Indian soil and there was no dearth of centres giving fillip to

philosophical speculations. Advaita of Śaṅkara had overcast the sky of scholastic disputes. Buddhism and Jainism were themes of discussion and the schools of thought like the Vaiśeṣikas, the Pāśupatas, the Kulācāryas, the Sāṁkhyas and the Bārhaspatyas were giving expression to their concept of *Self* and salvation. Somadeva's *Yaśastilaka* makes mention of these schools of thought and refers to the philosophical controversies of the time.

Works of Rājaśekhara, who was the literary ornament of the court of the Pratīhāra rulers Mahendrapāla and his son Mahīpāla, are conducive to the study of places, life at the court, customs and manners, toilets in use, languages favoured for literary compositions, the art of painting and the musical instruments which were in use in the orchestra of the time.

Apart from the creative literature, the contemporary legal literature in Sanskṛt is full of information with regard to social restrictions, the sources of law, the duties of the ruling king, the share of the state in the land-produce, the ethics of war, the rights of heirs etc. Medhātithi's commentary on Manu provides a contemporary legal treatise of profound importance for the study of the state and life during the period under review.

Besides the original sources, I have used the works of modern authors for which I express my indebtedness to them.

My thanks are due to my wife Mrs. Pushpa Mishra and Shri Bhola Nath Malaviya who helped me in the preparation of the volume in more than one way.

I shall be failing in my duty if I don't express my thanks and a deep sense of appreciation to the publishers who undertook the task of seeing this monograph in print at an early date.

Aśvin, Śuklapakṣa, Pratipadā, V.S. 2020 (1963 A.D.).

V.B. Mishra

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI—Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

ACS—Antiquities of the Camba State

AI—Alberūnī's India by Sachau

ASI, WC—*Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle.*

ASIR—Archaeological Survey of India Report.

ARASI, CC,—Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Central Circle.

ASR—Archaeological Survey Report by Cunningham.

BG—Bombay Gazetteer.

BI—Bāṅgālār Itihāsa by Banerjee, R.D.

BIS—Bibliotheca Indica Series, Calcutta.

CII—Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum by Fleet.

DKD—Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts by Fleet.

DHNI—Dynastic History of Northern India by Dr. Ray, H.C.

EI—Epigraphia Indica.

GG—The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa by Munshi, K.M.

H.E.—Harṣa Era

HIP—A History of Indian Philosophy by Dr. Dasgupta, S.N.

HKMC—History of Kanauj to the Moslem Conquest by Dr. Tripathi, R.S.

HRS—Hindu Revenue System by Dr. Ghoshal, U.N.

HI—History of India by Elliot.

HISI—(The) Historical Inscriptions of Southern India by Sewell

IA—Indian Antiquary.

IHQ—*Indian Historical Quarterly.*

IP—Indian Philosophy by Dr. Radhakrishnan, S.

JAOS—*Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

JBBRAS—*Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal* Asiatic Society.

JDL—Journal of the Department of Letters (Cal. Univ.).

JRAS—Jounal of the Royal Asiatic Society (GB—Great Britain ; NS—New Series).

JASB—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

JUG—*Journal of the University of Gauhati.*

JBORS—Journal of the Bihar Orissa Research Society.

JIH—Journal of Indian History.

K.E.—Kalacuri Era.

Ks—Karṇṇāṭaka-śabdānuśāsana (ed. Lewis Rice)

KY—Kitāb-i-Yamini of Al Utbī.

MB—Mahābhārata.

MAR—Mysore Archaeological Report.

MASB—Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

PAI—(The) Philosophy of Ancient India by Garbe.

PV—Pampa, Vikramārjunavijaya (ed. Lewis Rice).

RTT—(The) Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times by Altekar, A.S.

RI—Rājpūtāne kā Itihāsa by Ojha, G.H.

SB—Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on the Vedānta Sūtras.

SMHD—Sources of the Mediaeval History of the Deccan by Khare, G.H.

SS—Sulaimān Saudāgar (Hindi trans., published by the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā, Kāshī, 1922).

TVOC—Transactions of Vienna Oriental Congress, Arian Section.

Watters, On Yuan Chwang's Travels.

YIC—Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture by Handiqui, K.K.

CONTENTS

SOURCES

CHAPTER I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE GURJARA-PRATĪHĀRAS

The dismemberment of an empire in India is always marked by the rise of independent principalities. The disruption of the mighty empire of the Guptas let loose the disruptive forces which had remained inactive during the days of the Gupta supremacy. The political structure built up by the sagacity and diplomacy of the great Guptas crumbled to pieces. The North lacked a strong power which could wield authority and check the growth of independent but petty states. The north-western frontiers were left unprotected and before long they were subjected by the inroads of the foreign tribes. In this state of critical and crucial political climate, there appeared sparkling figures in the person of kings such as Yaśodharman of Mālava who strove to drive out the barbarians from the land of Bhārata. The curtain of darkness is lifted with the rise of the Vardhanas (Puṣyabhūtis) of Thāneśvara in Northern India. Father of the illustrious Harṣa of Kānyakubja (Kanauj), Prabhākaravardhana is reported to have harassed the Gurjaras in the celebrated work of Bāṇa, the Harṣacarita. Precisely though hard to determine the exact date of the rise of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras on the political stage of India, a conjecture may, however, be hazarded that round about the second half of the sixth century A.D. they came into prominence.

Seat of Power

The inscriptions of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras discovered at Jodhpur[1] and Ghatiyala[2] in the modern State of Rajasthan bear testimony to the fact that the Gurjara-Pratīhāras rose into prominence for the first time in Gurjaratrā which lies in Rajasthan.

1. *EI*, XVIII, pp 87-99
2. *JRAS*, 1895, pp 513-21.

It appears that their province of authority in Rajasthan subsequently extended from Ḍeṇḍavānakaviṣaya[3] (modern Diḍwana) in the west to Rajor[1] in the east, comprising the western part of the former State of Jodhpur and nearly the whole of the former States of Jaipur and Alwar.[5] Māṇḍavyapura lying in latitude 28° and longitude 72°* in Rajasthan was captured by the sons[6] of Haricandra who was the progenitor of the family of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Gurjaratrā. It is not unreasonable to believe that Māṇḍavyapura became the seat of power of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Gurjaratrā. A prince of the Gurjaratrā family, fourth in descent from Haricandra, Nāgabhaṭa or Nāhaḍa (c. 625-50 A.D.) made Meḍāntaka his permanent capital.[7] On Yuan Chwang's testimony some scholars believe that Bhīnmāla or Bhillamāla in Rajasthan was the capital of the Gurjara-Pratihāras. Yuan Chwang seems to have visited Kiu-che-lo (Gurjara)[8] and described Pi-lo-mo-lo (Bhillamāla) as its capital town. When Bhīnmāla actually fell in the hands of the Gurjara-Pratihāras cannot be determined from the available records. Brahmagupta, called Bhillamālakācārya—the teacher residing in Bhillamālaka, states that he wrote *Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta* in Ś.S. 550 (A.D. 628) in the reign of the Cāpa ruler Vyāghramukha.[9] It bears out that Bhillamāla was in the possession of the Cāpas till 628 A.D. It appears that the Cāpas could not withstand the onslaught of the Gurjara-Pratihāras in subsequent years and Bhillamāla was lost to the Gurjara-Pratihāras before Yuan Chwang paid a visit to the place. Māṇḍavyapura, Meḍāntaka and Bhillamāla seem to have been the capitals of the Gurjara-Prati

3. *EI*, V, p. 213.
4. *Ibid.*, III, p. 266, line 12.
5. *IHQ*, X, 1934, p. 338; *JBBRAS*, XXI, p. 413; IA, *LVII*, p. 181; Munshi, GG, III, p. 2; Dr. Buhler's identification of Gurjaratrā with modern Gujarat is untenable. The term Gurjaratrā was not used for Gujarat in the period under consideration. It was only towards the middle of the 12th century A.D. that the Cālukya records begin to speak of modern Gujarat as Gurjarabhūmi.

*Ray, *DHNI*, II, Map No. 6, p. 1053 (facing).

6. *EI*, XVIII, p. 95, v. 10
7. *Ibid.*, v. 12.
8. Watters, II, p. 249.
9. *Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta*, Canto 24.

hāra power in Gurjaratrā at different times. *The account of the* Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka that Meḍāntaka was the permanent capital of Nāgabhaṭa is not compatible with the account of Yuan Chwang. It cannot be hazarded that Nāgabhaṭa severed his relation with the main stem of the family and set up an independent kingdom at Meḍāntaka, for the Jodhpur inscription issued by the last but one ruler of the family maintains the line of succession in order. It is likely that when Yuan Chwang paid a visit to Bhillamāla it might have been treated as a second capital, as it is found in the case of Kālañjara and Khajurāho in the days of the Candellas of Jejākabhukti.

THE EARLY RULERS

Haricandra (c. 550 A.D.) and His Sons

Haricandra was the progenitor of the Gurjara-Pratihāra family of Gurjaratrā. The Jodhpur and Ghatiyala inscriptions refer to a line of kings extending over twelve generations. Taking twenty-five years as an average for each generation, the total period of their rule would be about three hundred years. As these inscriptions bear the dates 894 *(V.S.) and* 918 *(V.S.) respectively*, the founder of the dynasty may be placed at about V.S. 607=550 A.D.

The inscriptions refer to Haricandra as an 'illustrious Brāhmaṇa well versed in the meaning of the Vedas and Śāstras and a preceptor like Prajāpati.'[10] He was called Rohilladdhi. He first took the daughter of a Brāhmaṇa as his wife and, then, married a Kṣatria lady named Bhadrā who belonged to a noble family and was endowed with good qualities.[11] Bhadrā gave birth to four sons, Bhogabhaṭa, Kakka, Rajjila and Dadda, who were 'fit to hold the earth.'[12] They captured Māṇḍavyapura and erected a high rampart 'which was calculated to increase the fear of the enemies'.[13] The sons begotten on Bhadrā came to be known as Pratihāras.[14] The inscriptions trace the descent of

---

10. *EI*, XVIII, p. 95, v. 6
11. *Ibid.*, v. 7.
12. *Ibid.*, v. 9 ; the Ghatiyala inscription refers to only one son of Haricandra, *viz.* Rajjila, *JRAS*, 1895, p. 516, v. 3.
13. *EI*, XVIII, p. 95, v. 10.
14. *Ibid.*, v. 5.

the family *from the epic hero Lakṣmaṇa, the brother of Rāma,* and, as Lakṣmaṇa acted as a doorkeeper (Pratīhāra)[15] while rendering services to Rāma in his state of exile from Ayodhyā, the *family of Haricandra came to be known as the Pratīhāras.*

Narabhaṭa (c. 600 A.D.) and Nāgabhaṭa (c. 625 A.D.)

From Rajjila was born the illustrious son Narabhaṭa who on account of his prowess was called Pellāpelli.[16] His son and successor Nāgabhaṭa, known as Nāhaḍa in the Ghatiyala inscription, made Meḍāntakapura his permanent capital. It was perhaps during his reign that the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang paid a visit to the Gurjara country. His accounts refer to the then ruler of Gurjaratrā Yuan Chwang says that the king, who was a Kṣatriya by birth, was a young man celebrated for his wisdom and valour and he was a profound believer in Buddhism and a patron of exceptional abilities.[17] There is no reference in the Jodhpur or Ghatiyala inscription to the effect that any of the rulers of the family was a Buddhist. The Jodhpur inscription begins with a salutation to Viṣṇu (oṁ namo Viṣṇave). In the absence of any other positive evidence, it is difficult to give credence to the account of Yuan Chwang with regard to the religious predilection of the ruler of Gurjaratrā. It appears that as there was religious toleration, the Chinese pilgrim mistook Buddhism for the personal religion of the ruler.

Tāta and Bhoja (c. 650 A.D.)

From Nāgabhaṭa, 'begotten on Jajjikādevī, were born the two uterine accomplished sons named Tāta and Bhoja, who were oppressors of enemies.'[18] Tāta, who was of retiring disposition and who realised that the world was evanescent, conferred the administration of the kingdom on his younger brother Bhoja.[19] Tāta 'retired to the pious hermitage of Māṇḍavya,

---

15. *Ibid.*, v. 4.
16. *Ibid.*, v. 11 ; *JRAS*, 1895, v 4.
17. Watters, II, p. 249.
18. *EI*, XVIII, p. 95, v. 13.
19. *Ibid.*, v. 14.

adorned with streams and rivers, and practised there the rites of pure religion.'[20]

Yaśovardhana (c. 675 A.D.)

Tāta's son the illustrious Yaśovardhana, who was known for his prowess, attained celebrity by his own arms.[21] It was perhaps during his reign that Pṛthuvardhana of Sailvaṁśa[22] attacked the Gurjara territories. The Ragholi plates of Jayavardhana II state that Pṛthuvardhana, formerly having drawn the sword with his own arm, at once overcame the Gurjara country by his various attacks.[23] The success seems to have been short-lived. Yaśovardhana is credited with having rooted out all enemies[24] and passed on the reins of government to his son Canduka.

Canduka (c. 700 A.D.) and Śiluka (c. 725 A.D.)

Canduka was known for his prowess and charitable disposition.[25] His son Śiluka (or Śilluka) fixed a perpetual boundary between the provinces of Stravaṇi and Valla.[26] The latter may be identified with Vallamaṇḍala mentioned in the Jodhpur inscription[27] and the former must have been bordering on Vallamaṇḍala. Śiluka inflicted a defeat upon Bhaṭṭika Devarāja, who was perhaps a member of the Bhaṭṭi-clan, referred to in verse twenty sixth of the Jodhpur inscription, and obtained from him the umbrella[28] of the state. He got a tank excavated and a temple of Siddheśvara Mahādeva constructed at the holy place called Tretā. A city not named in the Jodhpur inscription owed its foundation to him.[29]

20. *Ibid.*, p. 96, v. 15.
21. *Ibid.*, v. 16.
22. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 42.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
24. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 96, v. 16.
25. *Ibid.*, v. 17.
26. *Ibid.*, v. 18.
27. *Ibid.*, v. 19.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.* v. 20.

Al Bilādūri, while giving an account of Junaid's incursions, mentions among other things that Junaid sent his officers, in addition to other places, to Marmad and Mandal and conquered Bailman and Jurz.[30] These places may be identified in their order with Maru-māḍa, which also comprises Jaisalmer and a part of the former State of Jodhpur, Maṇḍor, Vallamaṇḍala and Gurjara. The whole of the Gurjara country was attacked by the Arabs whose expeditions enveloped the country in ruins. Junaid was the general of Khalif Hasham and, as the reign period of Hasham ranges from 724 A.D. to 743 A.D., it is reasonable to assume that the expeditions were launched sometime after 724 A.D. and prior to 743 A.D. Śiluka seems to have restored peace and order after the Arab invasion, for the inscriptions refer to his son Jhoṭa exercising authority over the Gurjara territory and Jhoṭa conferred the administration on his son Bhillāditya after some time. Had there been no peace and order, Jhoṭa evidently would have not passed on the reins of administration to his young son.

Jhoṭa (c. 750 A.D.) and Bhilladitya (c. 775 A.D.)

Jhoṭa proceeded to Bhāgīrathī (Gaṅgā) after enjoying the bliss of kingdom.[31] His son Bhillāditya governed the kingdom, while young, and then bestowed it on his son Kakka. He proceeded to Gaṅgādvāra and after staying for eighteen years finally went to heaven by practising fast.[32]

Kakka (c. 800 A.D.)

Kakka was a man of learning.[33] His knowledge of prosody, grammar, logic, astronomy, with attendant arts, and poetry in all languages was extraordinary. He fought with the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri[34] (Monghyr). It is unimaginable that he would have fought against the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri on his own without being resisted on the way from Gurjaratrā to Mudgagiri by the

30 Elliot, III. I, p. 126 ; TVOC, Arian Section, p. 231.
31. *EI*, XVIII, p. 96, v. 21 ; *JRAS*, 1895, p. 516, v. 5.
32. *EI*, XVIII, p. 96, vv. 22-23.
33. *Ibid.*, v. 25.
34. *Ibid.*, v. 24.

Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kānyakubja through whose territories he must have cut his way to *Mudgagiri*. It appears that he accompanied Nāgabhaṭa II of Kānyakubja in his campaign against the king of Vaṅga.[35] This assumption receives strength from an account in the Daulatpur (Jodhpur) copperplate,[36] dated V.S. 900 = 843 A.D., which says that Bhoja I of Kānyakubja revived a grant in the province of Gurjaratrā which was originally made by Vatsarāja and was subsequently sanctioned by Nāgabhaṭa II. It may be inferred that the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Gurjaratrā had recognised the suzerainty of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kānyakubja and Kakka in the capacity of a feudatory of his suzerain power accompanied Nāgabhaṭa II in his campaign against the king of Gauḍa.

Bāuka (c. 825 A.D., known date V.S. 894 = 837 A.D.)

We do not know when Kakka ceased to rule. His son Bāuka, begotten on the 'pure, illustrious great queen Padminī of the Bhaṭṭi-clan,'[37] was in power in the year 894 V.S = 837 A.D.[38] The Jodhpur inscription refers to the disorder which seems to have prevailed at the time of his accession to the throne. The princes of his line had fallen out, his ministers deserted him, his army was seized with terror, his authority over other kings was undermined and he was left alone to cope with the situation. Bāuka first killed Mayūra, whose identity remains uncertain, and, then, his men.[39] The battle seems to have been fierce, for Bāuka left the horseback and fought while standing on the ground and the battlefield put on the appearance of a 'terrible burial ground.'[40] A mention of Mayūra in verse twenty-seven and again in verse twenty-nine in the Jodhpur inscription after an account of the forces arrayed against Bāuka in verse twenty-eight, gives an impression that Mayūra was the head of a confederacy which was

35. *Ibid.*, p. 108, v. 10.
36. *Ibid.*, V, p. 208.
37. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 98, v. 26
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-99.
39. *Ibid.*, vv. 27, 28
40. *Ibid.*, v. 2 .

formed against Bāuka. When Mayūra was put to sword, the confederacy dispersed. Bāuka's glory was manifest after this affray.[41]

Bāuka seems to have challenged the authority of the imperial Pratīhāras of Kānyakubja by asserting his independence. The Daulatpur plate, referred to elsewhere, gives an impression that Gurjaratrā held by Vatsarāja and his son Nāgabhaṭa II of Kānyakubja slipped out of the hands of the Pratīhāras of Kānyakubja during the short reign of Rāmabhadra who preceded Bhoja I. Bāuka seems to have been deprived of his hard-won freedom by Bhoja I, who is credited with having restored the authority of his family over Gurjaratrā.

Kakkuka (known date V.S. 918=861 A.D.)

Bāuka appears to have been succeeded by his step-brother Kakkuka, whose inscription, dated V.S. 918=861 A D., has been discovered at Ghatiyala. The inscription refers to his personal attributes such as modesty, philanthropy and civility.[42] In the year 918 (V.S.) he founded a market fit for the traders at a village called Rohiṁsakūpa. He erected two pillars like 'heaps of his renown' at Maḍḍoara and Rohiṁsakūpa[43] and dedicated a temple to god-Jina.[44]

Status of the Rulers

The rulers of the family did not assume pompous titles like paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja and parameśvara which were indicative of paramount authority. The absence of the pompous titles cannot be a determining factor with regard to the status of the rulers, for rulers like Harṣa of Kanauj and Pratīhāra Bhoja I did not assume such titles but doubtless they were sovereigns. Mathanadeva, on the other hand, was not a sovereign but he assumed such titles.[45] It will not be unreasonable to

---

41. *Ibid.*, v 27.
42. *JRAS*, 1895, pp 516-17.
43. *Ibid*, p. 518, v. 21
44. *Ibid.*, v. 20.
45. *EI*, III, p. 266

assume that such titles had little to do during this period to determine the status of a ruler. The early Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers of Gurjaratrā were sovereigns but the later ones seem to be the feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kānyakubja.

CHAPTER II

THE GURJARA-PRATĪHĀRAS IN BHṚGUKACCHA

The Gurjara-Pratīhāras appear to have occupied Bhṛgukaccha (Broach) under the command of Dadda I. With the single exception of the Nausari plate the inscriptions of the Bhṛgukaccha family of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras bear out that Dadda was the progenitor of this branch of the Gurjaras. The Nausari plate traces their descent from Karṇa.[1] Who this Karṇa was is shrouded in mystery. Whether he was a real historical figure or the elder half-brother of the five Pāṇḍavas cannot be exactly determined with the scanty information at hand. The name Śāntanu cited for the sake of comparison in line 15[2] of the plate may point out that both he and Karṇa were epic heroes. Indeed, the practice of tracing pedigree from some epic hero was very common in this period. But they were mostly concoctions of panegyrists.

Dadda I (c. 580-605 A.D.)

We cannot ascertain when Dadda I took up the reins of government. The earliest date available for the third chief of the dynasty is the year 380 (Kalacuri Era).[3] Allowing fifty years for the two generations that preceded him, it may be assumed that the line was founded in 330 (K.E.), A.D. 580. The Umeta,[4] Bagumra[5] and Ilao[6] grants, dated in Ś.S. 400, 415 and 417 respectively, open the chapter of their history a century earlier. But their genuineness is doubtful. Their characters, wording of the formal parts and the method in which the dates are expressed entirely

1. *IA*, XIII, p. 77.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
3. Scholars in general hold that the unspecified era in which the grants of the dynasty are dated should be taken to be the Kalacuri Era. *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.
4. *Ibid.*, VII, pp. 61-66.
5. *Ibid.*, XVII, p. 183.
6. *Ibid.*, XIII, pp. 115-119; *JBBRAS*, X, p. 19.

differ from the genuine grants of the dynasty. Over and above this, the Ilao grant seems to be written by the same Reva who wrote the two Kaira grants of 380 (K.E.), 629 A.D., and 385 (K.E.), 634 A.D.[7] These glaring discrepancies coupled with the fact that we hear of the Gurjaras for the first time in the last decades of the sixth century A.D., when they are said to have been harassed by Prabhākaravardhana, lend weight to the contention that they are forgeries and it was only in the last quarter of the sixth century A.D. that Bhṛgukaccha came into their possession.

Pt. Bhagwanlal Indraji, on the mere expression 'Nāndīpurītaḥ' or from the city of Nāndīpurī in the Kaira grants, avers that Nāndīpurī was their capital.[8] But most of the villages referred to in their grants are in the present Broach District. Thus, on the ground that the Kaira grants were issued from Nāndīpurī, we can hardly assume that it was their capital. Bhṛgukaccha, since remote times, has been an important place and it would perhaps be not wide of the mark if we take it as the seat of their power.

Their domain with Bhṛgukaccha as its nucleus included the whole of central Gujarat and the northern part of southern Gujarat which may roughly comprise the present Broach district, the Talukas of Olpad, Chorasi and Bardoli of the Surat district, as well as the adjoining parts of the former Baroda State, of the Revākāṇṭhā and of Sachīn. The river Mahī probably formed its northern frontier and the river Ambikā the southern one.[9] Yuan Chwang's account of Po-lu-kie-ch'e-p'o that it was 2400-2500 li or about 400 miles in circuit seems to be very vague.[10]

The Gurjara-Pratihāras of Bhṛgukaccha were feudatories.[11] To whom they owed allegiance is not apparent. The date 580 A.D. assigned to Dadda I so well corresponds with that of Dadda, the youngest son of Haricandra, the founder of the

7. *IA*, XIII, p. 72. See, however, the opinion of Dr. Buhler, *IA*, XVII, pp. 186-91.

8. *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 72.

9. *Ibid.*, XVII, p. 193; *BG*, I, pt. II, p. 315; *Ibid.*, pt. I, p. 115.

Siyuki (Beal), II, p. 239.

IA, XIII, pp. 81-87; *Ibid.*, pp. 88-91; *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty, that the two may be identified. The statement in the grants[12] that their forefather saw light in the lineage of the Gurjara kings— 'Gurjaranṛpativaṁśa' lends further weight to the proposed identification, for we know of no other Gurjara kings in this period except those of Māṇḍavyapura. Probably Rajjila[13] created a feudatory principality in the south under his younger brother Dadda, evidently as a bulwark against the waxing strength of the Valabhīs and the Cālukyas. It is just possible that after being subdued by the prowess of Cālukya Pulakeśi[14] II they acknowledged his suzerainty. It cannot, however, be asserted definitely, for in ancient India the vanquished were sometimes allowed to govern their territories after defraying the war indemnity.

These feudatories appear to have played a unique role in the history of Bhṛgukaccha. Dadda I uprooted the hostile family of the Nāgas who were probably the members of the jungle tribes ruled by Nirihullaka,[15] and nipped in the bud some of the family jealousies and quarrels which were gaining ground during his regime.[16] The lands lying around the Vindhyas are represented as his pleasure resorts.[17] The later inscriptions of his family describe him as a sāmanta[18] (feudatory). He was a devout worshipper of the sun.[19] The fragmentary grant of the year 346 (K.E.)=595-96 A.D., may be ascribed to him.[20]

Jayabhaṭa I alias Śrīvītarāga (c. 605-629 A.D.)

Dadda was succeeded by his son Jayabhaṭa I. The Kaira grants[21] attribute to Jayabhaṭa a sweeping victory over his enemies. The latter are not specifically mentioned. The

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 88.
13. See *ante*, p. 3.
14. *IA*, VIII, p. 242.
15. *BG*, I, pt. I, p. 115; *IA*, XVII, p. 195.
16. *Ibid.*, XIII, pp. 83, 89.
17. *Ibid.* Dr. Buhler opines that as the Vindhya hills end in the neighbouring Mālava, Dadda probably added a piece of this country for a time to the dominions of the Gurjaras. *Ibid.*, XVII, p. 195.
18. *Ibid.*, XIII, pp. 82, 88.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *EI*, II, p. 19.
21. *IA*, XIII, pp. 83, 89

spurious inscriptions, Umeta, Bagumra and Ilao, however, give us a clue. They tell us that Jayabhaṭa 'made expeditions in the jungles on both the shores (of the gulf of Kambay), just as the elephants roam in the forests growing both on the shores of the western and eastern oceans.'[22] It alludes in all probability to wars in Gujarat and Kathiawad waged against the Valabhīs who may have been the enemies put to rout by the superior forces of Jayabhaṭa[23] I. He was instrumental in extending his kingdom. He fought with the Kaṭaccuris (Kalacuris). The war appears to have resulted in the overthrow of the Kaṭaccuris and the extension of the Gujarat principality south of the Mahī.

Dadda II alias Praśāntarāga (c. 629-54 A.D.)

Jayabhaṭa was succeeded by his son, Dadda II, whose first known date is 380[24] (K.E.)=629 A.D. These were the palmy days of the Cālukyas, whose king, Pulakeśi II, had struck terror far and wide by the force of his arm. The Gurjaras succumbed to the prowess of Pulakeśi.[25] Perhaps it was the first setback for Dadda II in the very beginning of his reign. His subsequent relations with Pulakeśi cannot be ascertained with the data at hand.

The Nausari copperplate informs us that Dadda (II) gave protection to the lord of Valabhī,[26] Dhruvasena II or Dharāsena

22. *Ibid.*, VII, p. 65; *Ibid.*, XVII, pp. 199-200; *Ibid.*, XIII, pp 116-17. See also the different readings and translations of the lines *JBBRAS*, X, p. 25.

23. *IA*, XVII, p. 194.

24. *Ibid.*, XIII, pp. 81-87.

25. *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 242. Dr. Majumdar identifies the Gurjaras with those of Bhillamāla (*EI*, XVIII, p. 92). We have nothing positive to show that Pulakeśi led expeditions in northern India as far as Gurjaratrā. The word stands for the Gurjaras of Bhṛgukaccha.

Dr. Smith's suggestion (*JRAS*, 1907, p. 926) that 'Brahmagupta's patron, Vyāghramukha, apparently must be identical with the unnamed Gurjara king, who was defeated by the Cālukya monarch Pulakeśi II', is also untenable.

26 *IA*, XIII, p. 77.

IV, who was defeated by the great lord, the illustrious Harṣa[27] of Kānyakubja. As this event is not recorded in the Kaira grant of the year 385 (K.E.)=634 A.D., it must have taken place sometime after 634-35 A.D. We do not know how long such friendly relations with Valabhī lasted. Dharāsena IV is represented issuing grants in 648 A.D. from the victorious camp situated at Bhṛgukaccha. It may indicate a war between the Gurjara king and Dharāsena IV and the severance of cordial relations.[28] It may also mean, as suggested by Dr. Fleet,[29] that the grants were issued while Dharāsena IV was residing at Bhṛgukaccha, enjoying the hospitality of the Gurjara king, for the villages that were granted lay not in the Gurjara country but in the Kheṭakahāra-viṣaya.

Dadda II obtained the five great titles (Pañcamahāśabda).[30] He was a worshipper of the sun, for both he and his brother, Raṇagraha, sign their grants as devout worshippers of the sun.[31]

Jayabhaṭa II (c. 654-79 A.D.)

We do not get much information regarding Dadda's son Jayabhaṭa II who is described as a war-like prince in the Nausari cooperplate.[32] Probably it was during his reign that the Cālukya Jayasiṁhavarman took south Gujarat and drove away the Gurjaras north of the Tāptī.

Dadda III alias Bāhusahāya (c. 679-704 A.D.)

Jayabhaṭa II was succeeded by his son Dadda III. He obtained the five great titles.[33] He worshipped Śiva. The society was properly regulated according to varṇāśrama-dharma during his regime.[34]

---

27. *Ibid.*, XVII, p. 196 ; *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 74
28. *Ibid.*, XVII, p. 196.
29. Fleet, DKD, p. 316.
30. *IA*, XIII, pp. 83, 89 90 ; *EI*, V, p. 39
31. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 20-21.
32. *IA*, XIII, p. 77.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
34. *Ibid.*

He popularised his name Bāhusahāya by displaying *his strength in the wars waged against the kings of the east and* the west,[35] who were the Cālukya sovereign of Bādāmi or some ruler of Mālava and the lord of *Valabhī* respectively.[36]

Jayabhaṭa III

(c. 705-06 A.D., 735-36 A.D.)

Dadda's son, Jayabhaṭa III, 'quieted in battle the impetuosity of the Lord of Valabhī,[37] who was either Śīlāditya V or Śīlāditya VI. Presumably he allied himself with the Gujarat Cālukya Maṅgalaras to seize the continental districts from the Valabhī king.[38]

He obtained the five great titles[39] and assumed the title of Sāmantādhipati[40] (lord of barons). He was a devotee of Śiva.[41] His love of art and patronage to *Paṇḍits* shed lustre on his court.[42]

In his reign occurred the great invasion of the Arabs. Junaid, the general of Khalif Hasham, sent his officers to Barus (Broach). Junaid seems to have led the expedition sometime after 724 A.D. and prior to 743 A.D.[43] The invasion proved disastrous to the Gurjaras of Bhṛgukaccha and probably accelerated their downfall.

35. *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.
36. *BG*, I, pt. II, p. 316; *IA*, XVII, p. 198.
37. *Ibid.*, V, p. 113.
38. Altekar, RTT, p. 32.
39. *IA*, V, p. 114; *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 78
40. *Ibid.*, V, p. 114.
41. *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 78.
42. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 113-14
43. *See ante*, p. 6.

CHAPTER III

THE GURJARA-PRATĪHĀRAS IN MĀLAVA

A branch of the Gurjara-Partihāras seems to have occupied Mālava. Avanti, the cockpit of the time, became their seat of power. A passage[1] in the colophon to the *Jain Harivaṁśa* refers to a Vatsarāja as the ruler of Avanti in Ś.S. 705 (expired) =A.D. 783-84.[2] In the pedigree presented in the Gwalior[3] (Sāgar-tal) inscription of Gurjara-Paitihāra Bhoja I of Kānyakubja one Vatsarāja has been referred to as an ancestor of Bhoja I. The two Vatsarājas seem to be identical, for no other Vatsarāja has been mentioned in any of the dynastic records of the eighth century A.D. The lineage of Vatsarāja's family can be traced with the help of the Gwalior inscription. The inscription begins with Lakṣmaṇa as the progenitor of the family. Lakṣmaṇa has been described as the younger brother of Rāma who killed Rāvaṇa. Lakṣmaṇa without doubt is a legendary figure whose relation with the first historical figure of Vatsarāja's family cannot be determined with precision. The inscription refers to Devarāja or Devaśakti as the father of Vatsarāja. Devarāja was *one of the two sons of an unnamed* brother of Nāgabhaṭa. Beyond Nāgabhaṭa there is no reference except to that of Lakṣmaṇa. For Nāgabhaṭa the inscription says, "In that family, which extended shelter to the triple world and bore the emblem of Partihāra, the king Nāgabhaṭa appeared as in-

---

1 शाकेष्वब्दशतेषु सप्तसु दिशाम् पञ्चोत्तरेषूत्तराम् ।
पातीन्द्रायुधनाम्नि कृष्णनृपजे श्रीवल्लभे दक्षिणाम् ।।
पूर्वां श्रीमद् अवन्तिभूभृति नृपे वत्सादिराजे ऽपराम् ।
सौर्याणाम् अधिमण्डलं जययुते वीरे वराहेऽवति ।। *(Stanza 51)*

BG, 1896, I, pt. II, p. 197, fn. 2; *IA*, XV, pp. 141-42.

2. *EI*, VI, pp. 195-96; *JRAS*, 1904, p. 644; *JDL*, X, pp. 23-25; *JBBRAS*, XXI, p. 421, fn. 4; *EI*, XVIII, p. 230; *JRAS*, 1909, p. 235; *EI*, XII, p. 200; *MASB*, V, pt. III, p. 50; *ABORI*, XVIII, 1937, pp. 396-98; *IHQ*, VII, 1931, pp. 733-56.

3. *EI*, XVIII, pp. 99-114.

carnation of the old sage in a strange way".[4] Nāgabhaṭa *appears to be the first historical king of Vatsarāja's family which* ruled at Mālava.

Nāgabhaṭa I (c. 733-56 A.D.)

Vatsarāja's family began well under Nāgabhaṭa. We do not know his exact date of accession. A conjecture may, however, be hazarded. *The first known date of Vatsarāja is* 783-84 A.D. He was preceded by two generations. Assuming twenty-five years as an average for each generation that preceded him, we arrive at 733 A.D., which may be assigned to Nāgabhaṭa.

We are told in the Gwalior inscription that Nāgabhaṭa crushed the large armies of the powerful Mleccha King.[5] These hosts in all probability were the Arab forces that were then sweeping down the western borders of India. Al Bilādūri[6] observes that whereas other places were conquered by the officers of Junaid, the general of Khalif Hasham, they simply made incursions against Uzain. Uzain is no doubt the same as Ujjain. Evidently it is a tacit admission of their failure against the *king of Ujjain, a reminiscence of whose victory is preserved* in the Gwalior inscription. It may further be pointed out that the Nausari plates[7] of Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśirāja, dated 738-9 A.D., do not refer to the king of Avanti among those who were defeated by the Arabs. With this preliminary success against the Arabs, we presume that Nāgabhaṭa must have striven with all his might to drive them away from the Indian borders. Perhaps it was because of such vigorous drive of the Indian rulers that the Arabs during the time of Junaid's successor Tamim 'retired *from several parts of India and* left some other positions'.[8]

Almost at the same time when Nāgabhaṭa was laying the foundations of the future greatness of his family, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas came into prominence in the South. A conflict between the

4. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Elliot, HI, I, p. 126.
7. *TVOC*, Arian Section, p 231.
8. Elliot, HI, I, p. 126.

two rising powers seems to have become inevitable. We learn from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records[9] that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga subjugated the rulers of Kāñcī, Kaliṅga, Śrīśaila, Kośala, Mālava, Lāṭa, Ṭaṅka and Sindh. The Sanjan copperplates[10] refer to a Gurjara lord (Gurjareśa) who acted as a door-keeper at the Hiraṇyagarbha ceremony performed by Dantidurga at Ujjain. The ruler of Mālava and the Gurjara lord of the Sanjan copperplates seem to be one and the same person. Nāgabhaṭa appears to have sustained defeat at the hands of Dantidurga. How long this state of dependence and humiliation continued is not known even from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records. Nāgabhaṭa appears to have tried to retrieve the fortunes of his family. The Hansot plates[11], dated V.S. 813=756 A.D., inform us that the Cāhamāna feudatory Bhartṛvaddha II made a grant of the village Arjunadevigrāma situate in the Akrūreśvara-viṣaya (*Aṅkleśvara Taluka*) *to the Brāhmaṇa Bhaṭṭabhūta 'in the reign* of increasing victory of the glorious Nāgāvaloka', who has been rightly identified with Nāgabhaṭa under reference by Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar.[12] It is not unreasonable to assume that after the Rāṣṭrakūṭa menace was over, Nāgabhaṭa started on a career of conquest and carried his arms as far as the region of Bhṛgukaccha.

Kakustha

Nāgabhaṭa appears to have been succeeded by Kakustha, one of the two sons of his unnamed brother. The Gwalior inscription yields the information that Kakustha 'added to the renown of the family'.[13] He was also known as Kakkuka (*i.e.*, one who always laughs) 'on account of his habit of saying welcome things in an inverted manner'.[14]

9. *ASI, WC*, V, p. 88, v. 23 ; *IA*, XI, pp. 111 ff., lines 21-22 ; *EI*, IX, pp. 24 ff.
10. *EI*, XVIII, p. 243.
11. *Ibid.*, XII, pp. 203-04.
12. *IA*, 1911, p. 240 ; *EI*, XII, p. 200.
13. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 107.
14. *Ibid.*

Devarāja or Devaśakti

Kakustha was succeeded by his younger brother Devarāja or Devaśakti. Devarāja seems to have maintained the boundaries of his dominions intact, for the Gwalior inscription says that Devarāja 'curbed a multitude of kings (bhūbhṛt) by having destroyed their powerful allies (pakṣaḥ) and caused them to cast off their (free) movements (gati)'.[15] As regards the religious inclinations of Devarāja, we learn from records[16] that he was a devout worshipper of Viṣṇu (paramavaiṣṇava).

Vatsarājā (c. 783-84—795 A.D.)

Devarāja's son and successor Vatsarāja, begotten on Bhūyikādevī, was ruling in the year 783-84 A.D. The Gwalior inscription informs us that Vatsarāja forcibly wrested the empire in battle from the famous Bhaṇḍi clan, 'hard to be overcome by reason of the rampart made by infuriated elephants'.[17] The identification of this clan is a source of controversy. We know of no other Bhaṇḍi except one who is referred to in the Harṣacarita. But we do not know what happened to him and where he established his authority. Probably the Bhaṇḍi clan stands for the Bhaṭṭi clan[18], referred to in the Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka. Vatsarāja seems to have attained supreme status in Gurjaratrā or Central Rajputana, for an inscription found at Osia[19] says *that it was engraved during the reign of Vatsarāja.* This is further supported by the Daulatpur inscription wherein we are told that Vatsarāja granted a village in the Deṇḍavānaka-viṣaya of the Gurjaratrābhūmi.[20]

Having successfully wielded a position weighty with renown, Vatsarāja appears to have tried conclusions with the king of *Gauḍa. The Wani-Dindori*[21] *and the Radhanpur*[22] *grants of*

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-08.
16. *IA*, XV, p. 112 ; *Ibid.*, p. 140 ; *EI*, XIV, p. 183.
17. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 108
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-99 ; *JIH*, XXII, 1943, p. 98.
19. *JRAS*, 1907, p. 1010.
20. *EI*, V, pp. 208-13.
21. *IA*, XI, p. 161.
22. *EI*, VI, p. 243, v. 8.

the Rāṣṭrakūṭas tell us that Vatsarāja had become 'intoxicated with the goddess of the sovereignty (of the country of) Gauḍa that he had acquired with ease', and that his fame had 'reached the confines of the regions'. It cannot, however, be pointed out definitely as to where the two armies came in clash. The *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya* may give us some information. The *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya* yields the information that Durlabharāja Cāhamāna of Śākambharī enjoyed the Gauḍa land[23]. Durlabharāja's son Guvaka was honoured in the court of Nāgāvaloka[24], the son and successor of Vatsarāja. It is not unreasonable to assume that Durlabharāja accompanied Vatsarāja in his campaign against the king of Gauḍa. It may, thus, be inferred that the king of Gauḍa was defeated somewhere in his own land and the *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya* ascribes the glory of enjoying the Gauḍa land to Durlabharāja Cāhamāna.

A controversy centres round the identification of Gauḍa.[25] It appears that there were more than one Gauḍa. But the point at issue is, which is that famous kingdom of Gauḍa that has been referred to in the records of the eighth century A. D. With the data at hand it can safely be assumed that Gauḍa stands for Bengal. The Pāla kings of Bengal are called Gauḍeśvara (Lord of Gauḍa) in their records, whereas the rulers of no other province are as yet known to have assumed this title. In addition, the Haraha inscription bears out that Bengal was referred to in the inscriptions as Gauḍa as early, at least, as the middle of the sixth century A. D., for we have a verse in the Haraha inscription with reference to Iśānavarman which runs as follows : 'कृत्वा च यातिमोचितस्थलभुवो गौडान् समुद्राश्रयान्'।[26]
As the Gauḍas are said to have taken the shelter of the sea, Gauḍa here can only refer to Bengal which has a sea-coast. The Pālas of Bengal had established a strong monarchy in the east. The rising ambitions of the two appear to have contributed to their conflict.

The relations of the Pālas and the ruler of Avanti seem to have become cordial after the trial of strength. The Khalimpur

23. *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya*, v. 20.
24. *EI*, II, pp. 121, 126 and notes.
25. *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 163-64; *Ibid*, 1906, p. 442.
26. *EI*, XIV, p. 117.

copperplate says that the king of Avanti approved of the installation of Cakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj as a nominee of Dharmapāla[27]. Perhaps Vatsarāja made this diplomatic alliance to ward off the Rāṣṭrakūṭa menace. But he does not seem to have effectively resisted the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion. We learn from the Wani-Dindori and the Radhanpur grants of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas that Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa 'by his matchless armies having quickly driven into the trackless desert Vatsarāja, who boasted of having with ease appropriated the fortune of the royalty of Gauḍa, in a moment took away from him, not merely the Gauḍas two umbrellas of state, white like the rays of the autumn moon, but his own fame that had spread to the confines of the regions'.[28]

Vatsarāja appears to have taken refuge in the inhospitable tracts of Rajputana, where, as referred to elsewhere, he had already established his supremacy. We learn from the *Kuvalayamāla*[29] that Vatsarāja was ruling at Jāvālipura (Jhalor). It is not unreasonable to assume that after the northern expedition of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa, Vatsarāja made Jāvālipura his capital and organised raids to recover his lost territories.

27. *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 243-54.
28. *Ibid.*, VI, p. 243; *IA*, XI, p. 161.
29. *Kuvalayamāla*, v. 21.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOMAIN OF THE IMPERIAL PRATĪHĀRAS

Nāgabhaṭa II (c. 795-833 A.D.)

Vatsarāja's career after his rout in the battle against the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dhruva Dhārāvarṣa is shrouded in mystery. He was succeeded by his son Nāgabhaṭa II. Nāgabhaṭa's date of accession is a matter of conjecture. The Manne plates (Ś. S. 724=802 A. D.) allude to his struggle with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Manne plates were formerly regarded as spurious [1], but the newly discovered Sisvai grant makes it probable that they are genuine. Prof. Mirashi, who questioned the genuineness of the Manne plates, admits that there are no insuperable difficulties in admitting the Manne plates to be genuine. The genuineness of the plates is further supported by the fact that the alphabet of the inscription is fully in keeping with its date. The war as referred to in the plates must have been fought earlier than the date of the plates. The accession of Nāgabhaṭa II to the throne may be placed about 795 A.D.

Struggle with Govinda III

The Sanjan copperplates of Amoghavarṣa I, dated Ś. S. 793=871 A.D., tell us that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III 'carried away in battles the fair and unshakable fame of Nāgabhaṭa'.[2] Bāhukadhavala, who was perhaps a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa, is credited with having defeated one of the sections of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army[3]. This victory may have been a local success against the army of Indra, the Gujarat viceroy, for we are told in the Pathari pillar inscription of Parabala that Govinda III was victorious.[4] It further yields the information that Karka-

---

1. *EI*, XXIII, p. 215 f.
2. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 245.
3. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 1 ff.
4. *Ibid.* , 255, v. 14.

rāja, possibly a feudatory of Govinda III[5], 'caused Nāgāvaloka quickly to turn back' and the latter has been rightly identified with Nāgabhaṭa II[6]. The Manne plates[7], Nausari plates[8], dated Ś. S. 727=805 A.D., Sisvai grant[9], dated Ś. S. 729=807 A.D., Radhanpur plates[10], dated 27th July, 808 A.D. (according to Kielhorn,[11] but August 809 A.D. according to Altekar[12]) and Nilgund inscription[13], dated Ś. S. 788=866 A. D., refer to Govinda's struggle against Nāgabhaṭa II. As the Manne plates were issued in 802 A.D., it may be concluded that the war under review was fought before the date of the plates. It is difficult to fix up the exact date of the war with the data at hand.

Campaign against Kanyakubja

It is reasonable to assume that after his defeat at the hands of Govinda III, Nāgabhaṭa II must have taken some time to recover his strength. His campaign against the king of Kanauj is definitely a later event. The Sanjan copper-plates say that Dharma and Cakrāyudha had submitted to Govinda. Dharma and Cakrāyudha in this passage doubtless refer to Dharmapāla of Gauḍa and his protege Cakrāyudha who was ruling at Kanauj as a nominee of Dharmapāla. If Cakrāyudha was not ruling at Kanauj at the time of the northern campaign of Govinda III, what was the sense in referring to a weak ruler like Cakrāyudha in the Sanjan plates ?

A reminiscence of Nāgabhaṭa's campaign against the king of Kanauj is preserved in the Gwalior (Sāgar-tal) inscription of Bhoja I. Nāgabhaṭa defeated Cakrāyudha, 'whose lowly

5. *IA*, XL, p. 240.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.
7. *Sewell*, HISI, p. 35.
8. *IHQ*, XX, 1944, pp. 72-75, *EI*, XXIII, p. 210, fn 6, *Khare*, SMHD, I, p. 16.
9. *EI*, XXIII, pp. 214-17.
10. *Ibid.*, VI, pp. 239-51.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Altekar*, RTT, p. 65, fn. 49.
13. *EI*, VI, p. 102.

demeanour was manifest from his dependence on others'.[14]

Fight with the Pālas

The defeat of Cakrāyudha must have been a challenge to the king of Vaṅga whose vassal he was. The king of Vaṅga took the field against Nāgabhaṭa II. The Gwalior inscription says that 'having vanquished his enemy, the lord of Vaṅga, who appeared like a mass of dark, dense cloud in consequence of the crowd of mighty elephants, horses and chariots, Nāgabhaṭa, who alone gladdens (the heart of) the three worlds, revealed himself, even as the rising sun, the sole source of manifestation of the three worlds, reveals himself by vanquishing dense and terrible darkness'.[15]

Where was the Battle Fought ?

The battle probably took place at Mudgagiri (Monghyr). The Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka tells us that Kakka fought with the Gauḍas at Mudgagiri[16]. Kakka was a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II. It is unimaginable that Kakka could fight the Gauḍas single-handed. It may reasonably be concluded that Kakka accompanied his suzerain in his campaign against the king of Gauḍa.

Extent of Nāgabhaṭa's Empire

Thus, having subdued one of his powerful enemies, Nāgabhaṭa was able to extend the boundaries of his dominions. The kings of Āndhra, Sindhu, Vidarbha and Kaliṅga 'succumbed to his youthful energy as moths do unto fire'.[17] This simile of the Gwalior inscription may show that Nāgabhaṭa did not fight with them but being impressed by his majesty and power they of their own accord joined him, though ultimately they lost their freedom. The Āndhra country extended between the rivers Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā, whereas Sindhu stands

14. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 108.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 108, 112, v. 10.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 98, v. 24.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

for the lower course of the Indus. Vidarbha and Kaliṅga were modern Berar and Orissa respectively.

Nāgabhaṭa forcibly seized the hill-forts of the kings of Ānarta, Mālava, Kirāta, Turuṣka, Vatsa and Matsya.[18] These places and people may be identified with Northern Kathiawad, Central India, the wild tribes either of the Himalayan or other ranges, the Arab settlements in Western India, the territory of Kauśāmbī and Eastern Rajputana respectively. Thus, his suzerainty was established over all the regions from the east to the west and from the Himalayas to the Narmadā, excluding, of course, the north-western parts and the Pāla dominions. The Cāhamānas of Śākambharī also acknowledged his suzerainty. The Harṣa stone inscription of Vigraharāja informs us that the Cāhamāna Guvaka I was honoured in the court of Nāgāvaloka.[19] This seems to be a polite way of expressing a feudatory rank.

The Last date of Nāgabhaṭa's Reign

Nāgabhaṭa appears to have reigned till V.S. 890 (833 A.D.). The *Prabhāvaka-carita*[20] *says that in the month of Bhādrapada* in the year 890 (V.S.) Nāgabhaṭa immersed in the holy waters *of the Gaṅgā and died.*

Rāmabhadra (c. 833-36 A.D.)

Nāgabhaṭa was succeeded by his son Rāmabhadra, also called Rāmadeva or Rāma. Rāmabhadra ruled for about three years. Gurjaratrā and Kālañjara-maṇḍala seem to have slipped out of the hands of the Pratihāras during his short reign. The Daulatpur copperplate[21] says that a grant which was originally made by Vatsarāja and subsequently sanctioned by Nāgabhaṭa II in the province of Gurjaratrā was revived by Bhoja I. It may be inferred from the account of the Daulatpur plate that

18. *Ibid.*
19. *IA*, XLII, p. 61, v. 13.
20. *Prabhāvaka-carita* (ed. H.M. Sharma), p. 177, vv. 720-22; *EI*, XIV, p. 179, note 3.
21. *Ibid.*, V, p. 208.

the grant was ineffective during the reign of Rāmabhadra. The Gurjara-Pratīhāras of Gurjaratrā seem to have asserted their independence during Rāmabhadra's rule but Bhoja I retrieved the fortunes of his family and re-asserted his supremacy over Gurjaratrā. In Kālañjara-maṇḍala a grant which was made by Nāgabhaṭa II fell in abeyance during Rāmabhadra's administration. The credit of renewing the grant goes to Bhoja I.[22]

Another event of Rāmabhadra's reign was perhaps his struggle with the Pālas of Bengal. The Badal pillar inscription breaks the information that 'the lord of Gauḍa (Devapāla) scattered the conceit of the Gurjara lord'.[23] This does not appear to have been a decisive battle. The Gwalior inscription says that Rāmabhadra with the help of his subordinate kings, 'who had the best cavalry under their charge', 'forcibly bound down the haughty and cruel commanders of armies'[24]. Rāmabhadra seems to have been defeated by the Pālas in the first instance but later on he invoked the good offices of his feudatory chiefs and inflicted a defeat upon the Pālas. It may be added that as his hands were full with the war against the Pālas, he could not strive to recover his lost territories in Gurjaratrā and Kālañjara-maṇḍala.

The *Prabhāvaka-carita* represents him as a dissolute man living openly with a woman named Kaṇṭikā. He spent his time with his mistress and neglected the affairs of the state. His son Mihira Bhoja, supported by the ministers, killed him and ascended the throne[25]. It is difficult to lend countenance to the story, for Bhoja I is nowhere represented as a patricide.

Bhoja I (c. 836—889 A.D.)

Bhoja's accession to the throne marked an important era in the history of the Pratīhāras. He addressed himself to the problems which were thrown at his door by the previous administration. The Pratīhāra authority had become ineffective

22. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 15.
23. *Ibid.*, II, p. 160; *MASB*, V, No. 3, p. 60; *IA*, XIV, p. 163, fn. 7.
24. *EI*, XVIII, p. 108.
25. *Prabhāvaka-carita*, v. 731.

in Gurjaratrā and the Kālañjara-maṇḍala. Bhoja restored the suzerainty of his house over these two regions. In the Kālañjara-maṇḍala even the Candellas after coming to power continued to acknowledge, though formally, the suzerainty of the imperial Pratihāras of Kānyakubja till 954 A.D., for Vināyakapāla, a Pratihāra ruler, has been referred to as a suzerain in the Khajuraho inscription of Candella Dhaṅga.[26] In the north his sway extended up to the foot of the Himalayas. The Catsu inscription of Bālāditya informs us that the Guhila prince Harṣarāja conquered the kings in the north and presented horses to Bhoja[27], who has been identified with the illustrious Bhoja of Kānyakubja by Dr. Bhandarkar.[28] Harṣarāja seems to have fought these wars on behalf of his suzerain Bhoja I. The Kahla plate of Soḍhadeva further bears out that Bhoja's suzerainty was acknowledged up to the foot of the Himalayas. The plate tells us that Guṇāmbodhideva of the Kalacuri dynasty of Gorakhpur received some land from Bhojadeva[29], who has been identified with the Pratihāra king Bhoja I by Dr. Kielhorn[30]. That Guṇāmbodhideva was a contemporary of Bhoja I is further borne out by the fact that the inscription of the ninth successor of Guṇāmbodhideva is dated in V.S. 1134=1077 A.D.[31] Allowing twenty-five years for each reign that preceded the ninth successor of Guṇāmbodhideva, we arrive at the middle of the ninth century A.D. which may be assigned to Guṇāmbodhideva, when Kānyakubja was governed by Bhoja I.

Bhoja's Fight with the Pālas

The Kahla plate further yields the information that Guṇāmbodhideva 'had taken away the fortune of the mighty Gauḍa'.[32] Guṇāmbodhideva seems to have assisted Bhoja I in his campaign against the Pāla ruler Devapāla. The Gwalior

26. *EI*, I, p. 135.
27. *Ibid.*, XII, p. 15. v. 10.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
29. *Ibid.*, VII, p. 89.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 86, fn. 4.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-93.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

inscription[33] commemorates the event in the graphic words that the goddess of fortune forsook Devapāla and chose Bhoja as her overlord. It is difficult to ascertain as to how far Bhoja succeeded in occupying the territories of the Pālas, for his inscriptions are not found beyond the eastern limits of Uttara. Pradeśa.

Bhoja moves towards the South-west

It is reasonable to assume that after having subdued one of his powerful enemies Bhoja directed his attention towards other directions. The Partabgarh inscription deposes that 'a Cāhamāna family of kings was a source of great pleasure to Bhojadeva'.[34] This may allude to his expeditions in the south-western regions. Bhoja seems to have overrun southern Rajputana and the area around Avanti up to the Narmadā with the help of the Cāhamānas These Cāhamānas may be identified with the Cāhamānas of Śākambharī who were the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kānyakubja from the days of Nāgabhaṭa II. The account of the Partabgarh inscription that 'a Cāhamāna family of kings was a source of great pleasure to Bhojadeva' may be explained with the help of the references in the *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya*. We are told in the *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya*[35] that Cāhamāna Guvaka's sister, Kalāvatī, chose for her husband the lord of Kanauj in preference to other suitors. The lord of Kanauj is identical with Bhoja I, for Kalāvatī's grandfather Guvaka I was a contemporary of Bhoja's grandfather Nāgabhaṭa II. This matrimony accounts for a Cāhamāna family being a source of pleasure to Bhojadeva.

The Account of the *Vastrāpatha Māhātmya*

We are told in the *Vastrāpatha Māhātmya* of the *Skanda Purāna* that a Vanapāla (warden of the forests) came to Bhoja and informed him of a woman with the face of a doe roaming in the forests of Girnar with a herd of deer.[36] Bhoja after

33. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 100, v. 18.
34. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 180, 184.
35. *Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya*, V, vv. 30-31, p. 137 (Belvalkar's edition).
36. *Skanda Purāṇa*, *Vastrāpatha Māhātmya*, VI, 22, 23.

listening to the account of the Vanapāla, collected his forces and marched towards Raivataka. The place was surrounded and the doe-maiden was captured and brought to Kānyakubja. This shows that Bhoja carried his arms to Saurāṣṭra. Ānarta (Northern Kathiawad) was seized by Nāgabhaṭa II and Bhoja extended the sway of his family by subduing Saurāṣṭra. That Saurāṣṭra was conquered by Bhoja is further attested to by the Una inscriptions[37] of Balavarman and Avanivarman wherein his son Mahendrapāla has been referred to as a suzerain and there is nothing to show that Saurāṣṭra was conquered by Mahendrapāla.

Fight with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas

His exploits in the south-west brought him nearer to the territories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who were the traditional enemies of the Pratihāras. Bhoja measured swords with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas but in the beginning the stars were as unfavourable to him as to his predecessors. The Bagumra copperplate tells us that Dhruva of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas "easily put to flight the very strong army of the Gurjaras that was eager (for the fray) and reinforced by his kinsmen."[38] Dr. Buhler and Hultzsch identify the Gurjaras with the Cauḍas or Cāpoṭakas.[39] Their identification is untenable, for the Bagumra copperplate in a subsequent passage reveals as to who these Gurjaras were. Verse 41 of the plate says that though Mihira was united to fortune and surrounded by crowds of noble kinsmen, though owing to his courage he conquered all the regions of the world, he nevertheless disappeared, his face being covered by the darkness of defeat, after he had looked upon the eminence of Dhārāvarṣa that was greater than his own."[40] Mihira is doubtless Bhoja I, for according to the Gwalior (Sāgar-tal) inscription that was his personal name, and the Gurjaras are identical with the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Kānyakubja. This defeat was inflicted upon Bhoja not much

37. *EI*, IX, pp. 1-6; *Ibid.*, pp. 6-10.
38. *IA*, XII, p. 184.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 189.

earlier than 867 A.D., when the Bagumra plate was issued, for it is not referred to in any of the earlier Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants and even the Nilgund grant of Amoghavarṣa I, dated Ś.S. 788=866 A.D.,[41] does not throw light on the event.

This defeat rankled in Bhoja's mind. He seems to have avenged his defeat towards the end of his reign. Bhoja compelled Kṛṣṇarāja, who may be identified with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa II, to retreat hastily to his own country.[42] But the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records give quite a different account. The Bagumra plates, dated Ś.S. 810=888 A.D., of Kṛṣṇa of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas inform us as to how the grantor feudatory defeated the enemy at Ujjayinī, while king Vallabha (Kṛṣṇa II) was watching the army movements.[43] Further, we learn from the Bagumra plates of Indra III that old men vividly remembered in 914 A.D., when the plates were issued, the brave feats of the late Rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor (Kṛṣṇa II) in the sanguinary wars with the Gurjaras.[44] With these conflicting accounts it is difficult to arrive at a positive conclusion. The Pratihāras were maintaining a strong force in the south to keep the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in check.[45] Frontier clashes were inevitable between the two traditional enemies and the victory swung sometime on this side and sometime on the other.

Bhoja's Expedition to the North-west

In his expedition towards the north-west, Bhoja seems to have annexed some territories on the eastern side of the river Satlej to his empire. The Pṛthūdaka (Pehoa in the Karnal district of the Punjab) stone inscription, dated H.E. 276=882 A.D., refers to the transaction of business at the local horse-fair by certain horse-dealers 'in the auspicious and victorious reign of Bhojadeva'.[46] In addition, a close study of the verse 151[47] of

41. *EI*, VI, pp. 98-108.
42. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 176.
43. *IA*, XIII, p. 67.
44. *EI*, IX, p. 31.
45. Elliot III, I, p. 22.
46. *EI*, I, pp. 186, 188.
47. *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, I, Bk. V, v. 151.

the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* may bear out that Bhoja seized some of the territories of the Thakkiyakas, who may have been in the eastern part of the undivided Punjab.

Sulaimān's Account

Bhoja's empire was rich in resources and well-administered. The Arab traveller Sulaimān[48] (851 A.D.) observes that the king of Jurz (Gurjara) maintained numerous forces and no other Indian prince had so fine a cavalry. He was unfriendly to the Arabs, still he acknowledged that the king of the Arabs was the greatest of kings. Among the princes of India there was no greater foe of the Muhammadan faith than he. His territories formed a tongue of land. He had got riches, and his camels and horses were numerous. Exchanges were carried on in his states with silver (and gold) in dust, and it was said that there were mines of these metals in the country. There was no country in India more safe from robbers. It may be pointed out that after the death of Harṣa, it was Bhoja's empire which could emulate in some respects and excel in others the empire of the illustrious Harṣa of Kanauj.

Last Date of Bhoja's Reign

The *Vastrāpatha Māhātmya* of the *Skanda Purāṇa* says that on hearing the efficacy of the sacred waters of the Suvarṇarekhā from the doe-maiden, Bhoja expressed his desire to abdicate in favour of his son and repair to its holy sites.[49] The Ahar stone inscription[50] gives an impression that Bhoja was in power in 904-05 A.D. The first known date of Bhoja's son and successor Mahendrapāla is 893 A.D.[51] The last two dates (902-03 and 904-05 A.D.) of the Ahar stone inscription overlap the early years of the reign of Mahendrapāla. It would not be wide of the mark to assume that a portion of the inscription was engraved during the reign of Bhoja and other portions were added when Mahendrapāla was in power. It is likely that

48. Elliot, HI, I, pp. 3-7.
49. *Skanda Purāṇa*, X, p 15.
50. *EI*, XIX, pp. 52-62
51. *Ibid* . IX, pp. 1-6.

Bhoja abdicated in favour of his son sometime after 889 A.D., for we do not have any other inscription of Bhoja later than this date except the Ahar inscription.

Mahendrapāla I (c. 890-907 A D.)

The Pratīhāra empire suffered reverses in the north-west but remained intact in the south and the west and expanded towards the east in the reign of Mahendrapāla I. The Thakkiyakas who were dislodged by Bhoja I appear to have sought the help of the Kāshmīrī ruler Śaṁkaravarman to recover their lost territories. Śaṁkaravaraman, according to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* "caused the sovereign power, which the superior king Bhoja had seized, to be given up to the scion of the Thakkiya family, who had become his servant in the office of chamberlain."[52] This transaction seems to have taken place a few years after the accession of Śaṁkaravarman, for in the beginning of his reign Śaṁkaravarman had to face a civil war. He must have taken some time *to quell his rivals before he launched an attack upon the* Pratīhāra territories. Mahendrapāla was perhaps busy in his eastern conquests when Śaṁkaravarman attacked his north-western possessions. However, Mahendrapāla's authority remained undisputed over Pṛthūdaka[53] in the Karnal district of the Punjab.

The Eastern Frontier

Towards the east Mahendrapāla achieved spectacular success. Inscriptions of his reign have been found in Bihar[54] and the northern part[55] of the Rajshahi district of undivided Bengal. A large part of Bihar up to the northern sector of the Rajshahi district of the present East Bengal (East Pakistan) had acknowledged the suzerainty of Mahendrapāla I. As these inscriptions, except the *one discovered at Itkhori in the Hazaribagh*

52. *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, I, Bk. V, v. 151.
53 *EI*, II, pp. 242-50.
54. MASB, V, No. 3, pp. 64-65 ; ASIR, III, p. 123 ; IA, 1918, pp. 109-11 ; ASIR, III, p. 124 ; ARASI, CC, 1920-21, p. 35 ; ARASI, 1923-24, pp. 101-02 ; EI, V, Appendix, p. 47, note 5.
55. ARASI, 1925-26, p. 141.

district of Bihar, bear regnal years of Mahendrapāla's time, it may be presumed that by the time the last one of them, discovered at Guneriya in the southern part of the Gaya district of Bihar bearing the ninth year of Mahendrapāla's reign, was issued, Mahendrapāla had completed the conquest of the major part of Bihar up to the northern part of the Rajshahi district of East Bengal. As the Pāla ruler Nārāyaṇapāla (c. 854-908 A.D.) is not known to have issued any inscription in these regions after the seventeenth year[56] of his reign until the close of his rule of about fifty-four[57] years, it is evidenced that these regions were lost to the Pratihāras. Nārāyaṇapāla seems to have recovered them in the fifty-fourth year of his reign. Mahendrapāla seems to have been accompanied by Guhila II of *Catsu in his eastern campaign. Guhila is credited with having* defeated the king of Gauḍa and levied tribute from the princes in the east.[58]

The Western Sector

Towards the west Mahendrapāla's suzerainty over Saurāṣṭra remained unaffected. The Una inscriptions[59] refer to the rulers of Saurāṣṭra Balavarman and his son Avanivarman II Yoga as feudatories of paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara Mahendrāyudhadeva. Mahendrāyudhadeva is identical with Mahendrapāla I, for the Una inscription of the Valabhī Era 574=893 A D., represents Mahendrāyudhadeva as meditating on the feet of Bhojadeva and the other Una inscription of V.S. 956=899 A.D., gives even the standard form of his name Mahendrapāla.

Conclusion

Mahendrapāla's empire in the north touched the foot of the Himalayas[60] and in the north-west extended up to the Karnal district of the Punjab. In the south Bundelkhand was a part

56. *IA*, XV, pp. 304-10.
57. *Ibid.*, XLVII (1918), p. 110.
58. *EI*, XII, p. 15, v 23.
59. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 1-10.
60. *IA*, XV, pp. 105-13.

of the empire. In the east Magadha and the northern part of the Rajshahi district of East Bengal were annexed to the Pratīhāra dominions. In the west Saurāṣṭra acknowledged Mahendrapāla's suzerainty and the lower course of the Narmadā formed the south-western boundary of his territories.

Bhoja II (c. 908—13 A.D.)

Mahendrapāla was succeeded by his son Bhoja begotten on queen Dehanāgā-Devī. The reign of Bhoja was unknown till the discovery of the Bengal Asiatic Society's copperplate[61] of Vināyakapāla, dated V.S. 988=931 A.D. The Asni stone inscription[62] of Mahīpāla *alias* Vināyakapāla, dated V.S. 974=917 A.D., makes no reference to Bhoja and states that Mahendrapāla was succeeded by his son Mahīpāla. The omission of Bhoja's name in the Asni inscription has been a source of conjectures. A war of succession between the two step-brothers and the short and inglorious reign of Bhoja are cited as probable reasons for the omission. Indeed, the whole problem is shrouded in mystery. With the data at hand it is difficult to come to a precise conclusion. The last known date of Mahendrapāla is 907 A.D.[63] and the first known date of Mahīpāla is 914 A.D.[64] Bhoja's reign ranges in between these two dates.

The Contraction of the Eastern Frontier

The Pāla ruler Nārāyaṇapāla successfully avenged the loss of his territories in the west. Towards the close of his reign, he regained the lost territories and issued an inscription in Uddaṇḍapura (Bihar) bearing the fifty-fourth year of his reign. The Pratīhāra frontiers which had expanded to northern Bengal during the rule of Mahendrapāla I contracted in Bhoja's time. The Pratīhāra dominions in the east were now confined to the eastern limits of Uttara Pradeśa.

---

61. *I.A*, XV, pp. 128-41.
62. *Ibid.*, XVI, pp. 173-75.
63. *EI*, I, pp. 162-170. We do not have any inscription of Mahendrapāla I later than this date.
64. *IA*, XII, pp. 190-93

Bhoja defeated by Kokkalla

Bhoja could not withstand the forces of the Haihaya (Kalacuri) king Kokkalla of Tripurī. Kokkalla 'raided the treasuries of the Gurjara king'.[65] The Bilhari stone inscription of Yuvarājadeva records that Kokkalla, "having conquered the whole earth, set up two unprecedented columns of his fame in the quarter of the pitcher-born (Agastya, *i.e.* the South) that well-known Kṛṣṇarāja, and in the quarter of Kuvera (*i.e.* in the North) Bhojadeva, a store of fortune."[66] Kokkalla 'granted freedom from fear to Bhoja, Vallabharāja, the Citrakūṭabhūpāla Harṣa and rājā Śaṅkaragaṇa'.[67] Bhoja under reference is identical with Bhoja II, for Bhoja I, the mighty ruler and conqueror, would not have depended upon Kokkalla for his throne. It appears that at first Kokkalla inflicted a defeat upon Bhoja II and then reinstated him following the ancient traditions where the victor did not uproot the vanquished but restored the territories to him after levying some tributes.

Mahipāla I (c. 913-942—43 A.D.)

Encounter with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Indra III

The inglorious reign of Bhoja II came to an end sometime before 914 A.D. Mahipāla, who succeeded Bhoja II, found the stars unfavourable to him in the beginning of his reign. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III led an expedition to the North and devastated Kānyakubja. A reminiscence of his campaign is preserved in the Cambay plates of Govinda IV. We are told that 'the courtyard (of the temple of the god) Kālapriya (became) uneven by the strokes of the tusks of his (Indra's) rutting elephants'.[68] Indra 'completely devastated the hostile city of Mahodaya (Kānyakubja), which is even to-day greatly renowned among men by the name of Kuśasthala'.[69] It appears that Indra III first attacked Ujjayinī, for the temple of Kālapriya

65. *EI*, XIX, p. 78.
66. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 256, 264.
67. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 306-07.
68. *Ibid.*, VII, p. 38.
69. *Ibid.*

stands at Ujjayinī, and then finally captured Kanauj. Dr. Altekar has hazarded a hypothesis that the temple of Kālapriya may be the one that still exists at Kalpi[70]. It may be pointed out that there is no temple of Kālapriya at Kalpi. Kalpi has several temples dedicated to Śiva such as Pātāleśvara and Kapileśvara in the north, Rāmeśvara in the south, Ḍhuṇḍheśvara and Phāleśvara in the east and Bhūreśvara in the west, but none of them is known as the temple of Kālapriya. If any of these temples was originally known as the temple of Kālapriya and with the passage of time its name was changed to one of these above mentioned temples, then, there must be some vestiges to prove the contention. All these temples appear to be not more than two hundred years old. No ray of their being in existence since the tenth century is discernible. Unlike these temples of Kalpi, the temple of Kālapriya at Ujjayinī has stood for centuries and it was in existence in the tenth century A.D., when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III invaded Northern India.

Besides, the lines in the Cambay plates do not refer to immediate successive events. The poet has recorded the chief events of the northern expedition of Indra III. To believe that after resting in the courtyard of Kālapriya, the forces immediately crossed the Yamunā, is far from the ideas conveyed in the stanza under review. All the four lines of the stanza speak for the events without conveying the immediate relation with each other. If the following lines :

यन्माद्यद्द्विपदन्तघातविषमं कालप्रियप्राङ्गणम् ।
तीर्णं यत्तुरगैरगाधयमुना सिन्धुप्रतिस्पर्धिनी ॥
येनेदं हि महोदयारिनगरं निर्मूलमुन्मूलितम् ।
नाम्नाद्यापि जनैः कुशस्थलमिति ख्याति परांनीयते ॥

refer to immediate successive events, then, after crossing the Yamunā, the immediate event, as stated in the third line, should be the attack on Mahodaya, which is well-nigh impossible keeping in view the distance between Kalpi and Kanauj. This strengthens the line of approach that events are not in imme-

70. *Altekar*, RTT, p. 102, fn. 44.

diate relation to each other, though they are the chief events of Indra's northern campaign.

It appears that the forces of Indra on their way to Kanauj passed through Ujjain, Jhansi and Kalpi. The crossing of the Yamunā was at Kalpi after covering the distance from Ujjain.

Indra III in his northern campaign was assisted by his feudatory Narasiṁha Cālukya. We learn from the *Karṇāṭaka-śabdānuśāsana* that Narasiṁha "plucked from Gurjara king's arms the goddess of victory, whom, though desirous of keeping, he had held too loosely. Mahīpāla fled as if struck by thunderbolt, *staying neither to eat nor to rest, nor to pick himself up,* while Narasiṁha pursuing bathed his horses at the junction of the Gaṅgā and established *his fame.*"[71] *The junction of the* Gaṅgā referred to in the *Karṇāṭaka śabdānuśāsana* seems to be with the Yamunā and not with the sea, for *it is* reasonable to assume that Mahīpāla would not have fled away towards the territories of the Pālas who were defeated by his father Mahendrapāla in times of adversity. Mahīpāla seems to have been pursued up to Prayāga where the popular confluence of the rivers Gaṅgā, Yamunā and Sarasvatī takes place.

Date of the Campaign

The war took place sometime in 916-17 A D.

Indra III ascended the throne in Ś.S. 836=915 A.D.[72] He must have taken some time to prepare for his northern expedition. The Dandapura inscription[73] states that Indra's son Govinda IV was in power in Ś.S. 840=918-19 A.D. We may safely conclude that Indra III had led the expedition against Kanauj sometime in 916-17 A D.

Later Conquests of Mahīpāla

The Gurjara-Pratīhāra empire seems to have survived the shock. Mahīpāla perhaps courted the help of the Candellas to regain his throne. The Candella ruler Harṣa is credited with having placed Kṣitipāla *alias* Mahīpāla again on the throne.[74]

---

71. *Ks*, p. 20; PV, pp 3-4; JRAS, NS, XIV, p. 20; BG, I, pt. II, p. 380.

72. *Fleet*, DKD, p 415.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 417; IA, XII, pp. 222-23; EI, VI, pp. 170-77.

74. *Ibid*, I, p. 122, line 10.

Mahīpāla's subsequent career reverberated with conquests except the closing years of his reign which were menaced again by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion. His court poet and dramatist Rājaśekhara in an introduction to one of his plays, the *Bālabhārata*, presents a picture of Mahīpāla's wide conquests. Rājaśekhara says, "... in that (lineage of Raghu) there was born the glorious Mahīpāladeva who has bowed down the locks of hair on the tops of the heads of the Muralas; who has caused the Mekalas to suppurate; who has driven the Kaliṅgas before him in war; who has spoilt the pastime of (the king who is) the moon of the Keralas; who has conquered the Kulūtas; who is a very axe to the Kuntalas; and who by violence has appropriated the fortunes of the Ramaṭhas[75]." The Muralas were the people who were on the banks of the river Murlā which flowed in or near the Kerala country. The Mekalas lived in the Mekala hills in the north and west of the Chattisgarh district[76]. Kaliṅga is Orissan coast extending probably as far south as Vizagapatam. The Keralas were in the south between the Western Ghats and the sea-coast. Kulūta[77] is represented by the present Kullu district on the upper course of the Bias river. Kuntala was the ancient name of the western part of the Deccan. The Ramaṭhas appear to have been the neighbours of the Kulūtas, for they are placed along with the Kulindas in the northern division in the Vāyu Purāṇa and with the Pañcanadas in the western division in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā. According to another work of Rājaśekhara, the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*,[78] the Ramaṭhas were a people who resided beyond Pṛthūdaka in the north.

Mahīpāla appears to have carried his arms far and wide. From Rājaśekhara's description neither the route nor the chronological order of Mahīpāla's conquests can be determined. The places are so far-flung from each other that they cannot be treated to be in serial order of his conquests. The poet seems to be more concerned to adhere to the rules of metre and maintain rhythm than to arrange the conquests in chronological order. In his expedition to the South, Mahīpāla appears to have

75. *Bālabhārata* (ed. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 2.
76. *JASB*, 1897, pp. 99, 110.
77. *ARASI*, 1907-08, p. 260.
78. Ch. XVII, p. 14.

defeated the Kuntalas first and then advanced to the territories of the Muralas and the Keralas to subjugate them. On his homeward march from the South, Mahīpāla followed the course of the Eastern Ghats. He defeated the Kaliṅgas and then passed on to the territories of the Mekalas whom he caused to suppurate. From the Mekala hills either he moved northward and passing through Baghelkhand (Rewa) touched his territories at Prayāga or he moved to Bundelkhand and followed the same route to Kanauj which the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III had followed in his northern expedition. It is noteworthy that in his expedition to the South, Mahīpāla nowhere met the resistance of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. This may be explained from the fact that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda IV was given to pleasures and he had no time to look after the foreign affairs. Mahīpāla could have avenged his earlier defeat at the hands of Govinda's father Indra III but he does not seem to have mustered courage to attack the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Towards the north-west he subjugated the Kulūtas and the Ramaṭhas. He seems to have avenged the loss of the Pratihāra territories in the north-west during the reign of his father Mahendrapāla I.

Extent of Mahīpāla's Empire

Mahīpāla's conquest of the Muralas, Keralas and Kaliṅgas reminds one of the account of the southern conquest of Samudragupta, preserved in the Allahabad praśasti. Mahīpāla, like Samudragupta, did not annex the southern territories to his empire. Annexation was physically impossible because of the distance and the intervening territories of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Distance must have been a decisive factor in those days, for the Rāṣṭrakūṭas made successful inroads in the North but they did not annex the conquered territories to their dominions. Even the imperial city of the day, Kānyakubja, which lay at the feet of Indra III, was not annexed to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa territories. Mahīpāla's empire in the north-west included some parts of Sindh, for the Arab traveller Al Mas'ūdi, who visited the valley of the Indus in Hijri 303-04, states that the king of Kanauj was one of the kings of Sindh[79]. A major part of the Punjab

79. *Elliot*, HI, I, p. 21.

and the Kullu district on the upper course of the Bias river were included in the Pratihāra territories. In the south Mahīpāla's empire was bound by Bundelkhand which was under the Candellas who acknowledged the suzerainty of the imperial house at Kanauj even to a later date. In the south-west Mālava, which was lost to the Rāṣṭrakūtas in the days of Bhoja I, was reconquered by Mahīpāla. The Kahla copperplate[80] records that the Kalacuri prince Bhāmāna of Gorakhpur gained renown by conquering Dhārā. Bhāmāna seems to have accompanied his suzerain Mahīpāla in his conquest of Mālava which might have been accomplished during Mahīpāla's expedition to the South. Towards the east the empire did not extend beyond the eastern borders of Uttara Pradeśa. In the west Saurāṣṭra continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of the imperial Pratihāras[81].

The Closing Years

The closing years of Mahīpāla's reign were menaced by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion. The Deoli and Karhad plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III record that "on hearing of the conquest of all the strongholds in the southern regions simply by means of his (Kṛṣṇa's) angry glance, the hope about Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gurjara."[82] Kṛṣṇa III must have led his northern expedition sometime before 940 A.D., the year in which the Deoli plates were issued. The Karhad plates state that Kṛṣṇa's success was one of those achieved by him when he was yet a prince. Mahīpāla appears to have become panicky when he learnt of the northward advance of Kṛṣṇa III and he lost all hopes for the defence of Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa. Whether Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa were seized by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is not evident from the Deoli and Karhad plates. Expression used in the plates for Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa is fraught with possibilities. They might or might not have been lost to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Khajuraho inscription of Candella Dhaṅga, which attributes the conquest of Kālañjara to the Candella ruler Yaśovarman, does not refer to

---

80. *EI*, VII, pp. 89-90.
81. *IA*, XII, pp. 190-95.
82. *EI*, V, p. 194, v. 25; *Ibid.*, IV, p. 284, v. 30.

the Rāṣṭrakūṭas among the peoples defeated by him. The inscription which refers to the *Guaḍas, Khaśas, Kośalas*, Kāshmīris, Mithilas, Mālavas, Cedis, Kurus and Gurjaras feeling the brunt of Yaśovarman's prowess could not have avoided a reference to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had there been any encounter with them. In my opinion, the forts of Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa continued to be under the control of the Pratihāras even after the northern expedition of Kṛṣṇa III. Yaśovarman seized Kālañjara from the Pratihāras of Kānyakubja sometime before 954 A.D.

CHAPTER V

THE BREAK-UP OF THE EMPIRE

The Later Pratihāras

Mahendrapāla II and Devapāla

The sun of Pratīhāra glory set with Mahīpāla. The later rulers of the dynasty could not wield authority effectively. The feudatories asserted their independence and severed relations with the imperial house at Kanauj. The edifice of the empire crumbled to pieces with the invasion of Mahmūd of Ghaznī whose valiant hands swept the glory of Western India right down to Kanauj like a gust of wind. The history of the later Pratihāras begins with the ascendency of Mahendrapāla II. Son of Mahīpāla, begotten on queen Prasādhanādevī of Devathāddhi family, Mahendrapāla was in power in V. S 1003=946 A.D., when an inscription found at Partabgarh[1] (in southern Rajputana) was issued from Mahodaya (Kanauj). An epigraph[2] discovered at Rakhetra, near Canderi in Gwalior, records that Vināyakapāla alias Mahīpāla got constructed certain water-works at Rakhetra at an immense cost in the year (Vikrama) 999-1000=942-43 A.D. Mahendrapāla appears to have ascended the throne after 943 A.D. The Siyadoni (Gwalior) inscription[3], dated (V. S.) 1005=948 A.D., does not make any reference to Mahendrapāla and states that Kṣitipāla *alias* Mahīpāla was succeeded by his son Devapāla. This omission may be explained either by the extreme shortness of Mahendrapāla's reign or by the assumption that the relations between the two brothers were inimical. Devapāla seems to have ascended the throne shortly before 948 A.D. Mahendrapāla's reign of about four years was not marked by any event. As his officers[4] were functioning at Ujjain and Maṇḍapikā or Māṇḍū, it may reasonably be concluded that the

1. *EI*, XIV, pp. 176-86.
2. *ARASI*, 1924-25, p. 168.
3. *EI*, I, pp. 162-79.
4. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp 180, 185-87.

region of Mālava continued to be under the authority of the Pratihāras during the reign of Mahendrapāla.

The reign-period of Mahendrapāla's successor Devapāla is marked with the rise of the feudatories virtually to independent power. Bundelkhand which formed a part of the Pratihāra empire and marked its southern boundary was convulsing with the activities of the Candellas. The Candellas, though formally recognised the suzerainty of the imperial house at Kanauj in their official record, were a standing menace to the territorial integrity of the Pratihāra empire. The Candella Yaśovarman is described as a 'scorching fire to the Gurjaras'[5] (saṁjvaro Gurjarāṇām) in the Khajuraho inscription of Dhaṅga. The expression 'saṁjvaro Gurjarāṇām' may suggest a violent conflict of Yaśovarman with the Pratihāras. The inscription further records that Yaśovarman had conquered Kālañjara.[6] This leaves no room to doubt a violent encounter between the two resulting in the seizure of Kālañjara by Yaśovarman. In verses 42-43 of the inscription a transaction of an image of Vaikuṇṭha which Yaśovarman set up in a temple constructed by him is recorded. It is stated that Yaśovarman received the image of Vaikuṇṭha from the Hayapati-Devapāla, the son of Herambapāla. Devapāla of the inscription is identical with Pratihāra Devapāla, for Heramba and Vināyaka are synonymous and Pratihāra Devapāla's father is known to have other synonymous names like Kṣitipāla and Mahīpāla. The transaction of the image was definitely not out of favour but of fear and it shows how weak the Pratihāra power had become at Kanauj.

Dr. Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha refers to one unpublished, damaged and fragmentary inscription found in a small Jaina temple at Ahar, near Udaipur. The inscription states that the Guhila prince Allaṭa killed in fight his powerful enemy Devapāla[7]. It is difficult to identify this Devapāla with the materials at hand. If this Devapāla is identical with the Pratihāra king[8] under review, it may be concluded that the

5. *Ibid.*, I, p. 126.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 133, v. 31.
7. *Ojha*, RI, II, p. 428.
8. According to Dr. Barnett, the identification is 'possible but not very probable'. Ray, *DHNI*, II, p. 1170, fn. 2.

Pratīhāra empire was on the wane and rulers of small states were rising to power.

Vināyakapāla II

Devapāla appears to have been succeeded by Vināyakapāla II. The name of Vināyakapāla was brought to light by the discovery of the Khajuraho inscription of Candella Dhaṅga, dated 1011=954 A.D. The inscription records that "while the illustrious Vināyakapāladeva is protecting the earth, the earth is not taken possession of by the enemies, who have been annihilated"[9] Vināyakapāla must have been a Pratīhāra ruler of Kanauj, for it was the Pratīhāras who were invoked as suzerains during the period under review. The suffix 'pāla', common with the names of the later Pratīhāras, may further lend weight to the contention that Vināyakapāla of the Khajuraho inscription was in the lineage of the Pratīhāras of Kanauj. Probably Vināyakapāla was a son of Devapāla whom he succeeded shortly before 954 A.D. That the empire was threatened by the enemies is evident from the expression used in the Khajuraho inscription in relation to Vināyakapāla. The inscription gives him the credit of protecting the earth (*i.e.* kingdom) and states that the enemies were uprooted. It is noteworthy that Vināyakapāla is eulogised in that inscription of the Candellas wherein the Candella ruler Yaśovarman in earlier lines is described as a scorching fire to the Gurjaras. Vināyakapāla was not merely a figurehead. He strove to protect his possessions but his success was short-lived. The process of disintegration which had started earlier reached its culmination during the succeeding reigns.

An inscription found at Bayana in Rajasthan, dated V.S. 1012=955 A.D., refers to one Mahārājādhirāja Mahīpāla. The Bayana region must have been within the Pratīhāra dominions, for Rajor, lying further to its north-west, continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of the imperial line at Kanauj. Vināyakapāla and Mahīpāla appear to be one and the same person. As Mahīpāla I is known to have another name, Vināyakapāla, it is not wide of the mark to presume, keeping

9. *EI*, I, p. 125.

the earlier precedent in view, that Vināyakapāla of the Khajuraho inscription too had Mahīpāla as his second name. Further, the known dates of the two are so close that the event of a second ruler coming to the throne in the course of one year, though possible, is not probable. Vināyakapāla's reign seems to have come to an end sometime before 959 A.D., when another Pratihāra ruler Vijayapāla was in power.

Vijayapāla (959 A.D.)

The Rajor inscription[10], discovered in the ruins of Parnagar in the former State of Alwar, Rajputana, dated the year (*Vikrama*) 1016=959 A.D., represents Vijayapāla meditating on the feet of Kṣitipāla. A comparison of the genealogical statements of the Siyadoni[11] and the Rajor inscriptions suggests that Vijayapāla was a son of Mahīpāla I. The disintegration of the Pratihāra empire was all but complete during the reign of Vijayapāla. The Pratīhāra power was threatened by the rising rulers in almost all the quarters of the empire.

The Kalacuris of Tripurī

The Goharwa plates of Kṛṣṇa state that the Kalacuri ruler Lakṣmaṇarāja of Tripurī conquered the kings of Vaṅgāla, Pāṇḍya, Lāṭa, Gurjara and Kāshmīra[12]. Lakṣmaṇarāja was three generations earlier than Gāṅgeya, a ruler of the same lineage, who seems to have died in 1041 A.D.[13] Allowing twenty-five years for each generation that preceded Gāṅgeya, we may place Lakṣmaṇarāja round about 965 A.D., when Kanauj was ruled by Vijayapāla. Lakṣmaṇarāja seems to have defeated Vijayapāla, for the Pratihāras of Kanauj exercised authority over the Gurjara land (Gurjaratrā). The aggressive design of the Kalacuris must have been a rude shock to the decaying empire.

The Solankis of Anahilapātaka

In western India Mūlarāja founded the Solanki or Caulukya

10. *Ibid.*, III, pp. 263-67.
11. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 162-79.
12. *Ibid.*, XI, p. 142.
13. Ray, DHNI, II, p. 777.

dynasty at Aṇahilapāṭaka (Anhilwada)[14]. Gujarat completely *slipped out of* the hands of the Pratīhāras. The Kadi grant[15] records that Mūlarāja acquired the Sārasvata maṇḍala by the prowess of his own arms. The secession of Saurāṣṭra cannot be kept far off from the exploits of Mūlarāja. The Pratīhāras lost their control over Western India with the rise of the Solankis. Further, we learn from the Vadnagar praśasti that Mūlarāja took captive "the fortune of the kingdom of the Cāpoṭkaṭa princes[16]." The *Cāpoṭkaṭas had their homeland in South* Rajputana. Mūlarāja seems to have overrun the region of South Rajputana which formed a part of the Pratīhāra empire. The authority of the Pratīhāras had contracted towards the west and the south-west.

The Defection in Rajputana : Mathanadeva of Rajor

In northern Rajputana the Pratīhāras exercised nominal control during the period of their decline. Mathanadeva of Rajor, who was a feudatory of Vijayapāla, assumed the imperial titles of Mahārājādhirāja and Parameśvara[17]. This shows that though Mathanadeva was maintaining an outward show of submission, he was putting himself in the line of the imperial rulers.

The Cāhamānas of Śākambharī

In central Rajputana the Cāhamānas of Śākambharī made themselves supreme. The Cāhamānas of Śākambharī had acknowledged the suzerainty of the imperial Pratīhāras from the days of Nāgabhaṭa II. The ties of round about one hundred and fifty years were thrown to winds. We learn from the Harṣa stone inscription of Vigraharāja II that the Cāhamāna

14. According to Merutunga's Vicāraśreṇī, Mūlarāja ascended the throne in V.S. 1017=961 A.D. (BG, I. pt. I, p. 156). But the Sambhar inscription gives the Vikrama date 998=941 A.D., for the accession of Mūlarāja (*IA*, 1929, pp. 235-36, v. 8).

15. *IA*, VI, p. 191, line 7.

16. *EI*, I, pp. 296, 301, v. 5 ; *Ibid.*, X, p. 78.

17. *Ibid.*, III, p. 266.

Siṁharāja subdued the Tomara chief (nāyaka) Salavaṇa[18] and put to flight and captured the hosts that had gathered under his command. The princes who were captured in this struggle were kept in prison till the "universal sovereign of the earth, who belonged to the family of Raghu, came in person to his house to liberate them."[19] The universal sovereign of the Raghu family referred to in the inscription must have been one of the later Pratihāras, for it was they who traced their origin from Lakṣmaṇa, the epic hero and a member of the family of Raghu. That the Pratihāras were even now invoked as overlords is evident from the Khajuraho inscription of Dhaṅga. It may, therefore, be suggested that the universal sovereign in whose reign the event took place was Pratihāra Vijayapāla. 'The fact that the overlord had to come personally to the house of his feudatory to effect the release of prisoners is sufficient evidence of the increasing importance of the Cāhamānas of Śākambhari and of the decline of the imperial power of Kanauj'.[20] It appears that sometime before 973 A.D., when the Harṣa stone inscription of Vigraharāja II was issued, the Cāhamānas of Śākambhari had completely freed themselves from the control of the Pratihāras. The Harṣa stone inscription records that Vigraharāja II "rescued both the fortune of his family and the fortune of victory from the distress which had befallen them."[21] Vigraharāja II was the successor of Siṁharāja. The process of defection which had started in the reign of Siṁharāja continued during the succeeding reign. The Pratihāras were losing their control over Rajputana.

The Guhilots of Medapāṭa

In the south-west of Rajputana the Guhilots of Medapāṭa broke off all relations with the effete imperial power at Kanauj not long after the *Vikrama* year 1003=946 A.D. As referred to elsewhere, the Guhila prince Allaṭa probably killed Pratihāra Devapāla. Allaṭa's father Bhartṛpaṭṭa II had married the

18. The passage may also mean 'subdued the Tomara nāyaka.. together with Lavaṇa.' *IA*, 1912, pp. 57 ff. ; *EI*, II, pp. 116 ff.

19. *EI*, II, p. 122 ; *IA*, XLII, p. 58.

20. *Ray*, DHNI, II, p. 1064.

21. *EI*, II, pp. 122, 127, v. 20 ; *IA*, XLII, p. 62, v. 20.

Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Mahālakṣmī[22]. This matrimonial relation may bear out that Bhartṛpaṭṭa II[4] had formed an alliance with the traditional enemies of the Pratihāras. The Atpur inscription[23] of Śaktikumāra states that Allaṭa's son Naravāhana married the daughter of a Cāhamāna named Jejaya. Thus, the Guhila-putras of Medapāṭa were consolidating their position through matrimonial relations.

Candella Dhaṅga

As stated earlier, the emergence of the Candellas as one of the first-class powers in the country south of the Yamunā was a standing menace to the Pratihāras. We learn from the Khajuraho inscription that the Candella king Dhaṅga ruled the earth "playfully acquired by the action of his long and strong arms, as far as Kālañjara, and as far as Bhāsvat situated (?) on the banks of the river Mālva (Mālava-nadī); from here to the banks of the river Kālindī, and from here also to the frontiers of the Cedi country (deśa), and even as far as that mountain called Gopa (Gopābhidhāna-giri), which is the unique abode of marvel."[24] The acquisition of the mountain called Gopa (the region of Gopādri or Gwalior) must have been a great blow to the prestige of the imperial Pratihāras who exercised control over the Gwalior region. Verse 6 of the Sāsbahū temple inscription of Mahipāladeva states that the Kacchapaghāta prince Vajradāman "put down the rising valour of the ruler of Gādhinagara (Kanauj), and his proclamation drum, which fulfilled his vow of heroism, resounded in the fort of Gopādri, conquered in battle by his irresistible strong arm".[25] The verse thus clearly indicates that the fortress of Gopādri was occupied by the Kacchapaghāta Vajradāman as a result of his victory over the ruler of Kanauj. Dr. Ray[26] suggests that the Kacchapaghātas were at first feudatories of the imperial Pratihāras till they gained the mastery of the Gwalior fort by

22. *Ibid.*, 1910, p. 191, v. 4.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 186-91.
24. *EI*, I, pp. 129, 134, v. 45.
25. *IA.*, XV, pp. 36, 41.
26. *Ray*, DHNI, II, pp. 822-23.

defeating the ruler of Kanauj. The sovereignty that they thus acquired was short-lived, as they had very soon to yield to the rising power of the Candellas and acknowledge their hegemony. But we learn from the Khajuraho inscription of Dhaṅga that the mountain called Gopagiri came to be included within the Candella domain as early as 954 A.D., when the inscription was issued. If the Candellas had conquered Gopagiri before 954 A.D., how could Vajradāman (977 A.D.[27]) conquer it from the Pratihāras ? There is no evidence to show that the Candellas lost the Gwalior fort to the Pratihāras between 954 and 977 A.D. (the only known date of Vajradāman), so that it might have been possible for Vajradāman to conquer it again from the Pratihāras. It may be deduced that the Candella and the Kacchapaghāta episodes connected with the conquest of Gopādri are not separate stories, but that they refer to a single event in which the Candellas and the Kacchapaghātas joined hands. It appears that the fort of Gopādri was occupied by Vajradāman for the Candellas.

The possession of Gopādri and Kālañjara must have strengthened the position of the Candellas in Central India. They seem to have received a fillip to launch attacks in the valley of the Gaṅgā. The Nanyaura copperplate[28], issued in the year (*Vikrama*) 1055=998 A.D. from Kāśikā (Vārāṇasī), records that Dhaṅga granted the village of Yulli (?) situated in the Uṣaravāha to the Bhaṭṭa Yaśodhara at Kāśikā. The Candella forces were evidently operating in the Gaṅgā valley and it is not unlikely that shortly before the date of the Nanyaura plate Dhaṅga had seized Vārāṇasī. The possession of Prayāga (Allahabad), it is suggested, is probably indicated by a reference to the effect that Dhaṅga 'entered into beatitude' by abandoning his body in the waters of the Jāhnavī (Gaṅgā) and the Kālindī (Yamunā[29]). An inscription[30], dated V.S. 1084=1027 A.D. found at Jhūsī near Prayāga, records that the Pratihāra ruler Trilocanapāla made a grant of the village of Labhundaka in the

27. *JASB*, XXXI, p. 393.
28. *IA*, XVI, pp. 203, 206.
29. *EI*, I, pp. 139, 146, v. 55.
30. *IA*, XVIII, pp. 33-35.

Asurābhaka-viṣaya to the Brāhmaṇas of Pratiṣṭhāna (Jhūsi). This shows that the Pratihāras were in possession of Prayāga and its adjoining areas till a later date, and it cannot, therefore, precisely be stated that Prayāga was seized by Dhaṅga. We learn from the Mhow inscription that Dhaṅga attained to 'supreme lordship after inflicting a defeat over the king of Kānyakubja[31]'. "If true," as observed by Dr. Ray, "this statement shows that the hegemony which the rulers of Kanauj so long enjoyed in Northern India was at last taken away from them by the Candellas during the reign of Dhaṅga. But as Utbī in 409 A.H. (1018 A.D.) describes the Kanauj ruler Rājyapāla as 'the chief of all princes of India[32],' we must conclude that the halo of imperialism still lingered over the brow of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras for at least some time after Dhaṅga's death[33]."

The Second Expedition of Kṛṣṇa III

When the Pratīhāra power was sinking, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas once more appeared on the scene. Kṛṣṇa III seems to have led a second expedition to the North towards the close of his reign. The Kudlur plates[34] of the Gaṅga chief Mārasiṁha state that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇarāja himself performed the ceremony of crowning Mārasiṁha as the ruler of Gaṅgapādi, when he had set out on an expedition to the North. The Karya inscription[35] gives the *Prabhava Saṁvatsara, Śaka Saṁvat* 890 (current)= 967-68 A.D., *as* the fifth regnal year of *Mārasiṁha. It may be* assumed that Kṛṣṇa III had undertaken this expedition not much earlier than 963-64 A.D. Kṛṣṇa III seems to have been assisted in his northern campaign by the Gaṅga chief Mārasiṁha, for we are told in the ŚravaṇaBelgola epitaph[36] that Mārasiṁha conquered the northern regions for Kṛṣṇa III. That Kṛṣṇa III had led a second expedition can be further accounted from the discovery of an epigraph[37] in Canarese at Jura in the former

31. *EI*, I, pp. 197, 203, v. 3; *ASR*, XII, p. 359.

32. *Utbi*, KY (trans. from the Persian version by Reynolds), p. 456.
33. *Ray*, DHNI, II, p. 680.
34. *MAR*, 1921, pp. 17 ff.
35. *Fleet*, DKD, p. 305.
36. *EI*, V, p. 176.
37. *Ibid.*, XIX, pp. 287-90.

State of Maihar in the Baghelkhand Agency, now merged with the modern State of Madhya Pradeśa. The Jura epigraph eulogises Kṛṣṇa III and he assumes therein the full imperial titles of paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja and parameśvara. The inscription seems to have been set up during the course of his second expedition, for the first expedition was led by him when he was just a prince.

Testimony of the Karda Grant

The Rāṣṭrakūṭa menace does not appear to have been over with the northern expeditions of Kṛṣṇa III. The Karda grant[38], dated Ś.S. 894 (expired)=972 A.D., tells us that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Karka II defeated the armies of the Colas and the Gurjaras. These expeditions must have dealt a severe blow to the strength of the Pratihāras.

The Paramāras of Mālava

The Paramāras appear to have taken advantage of the prevailing confusion and made themselves supreme in Mālava. That they were at Ujjayinī in 974 A.D. is borne out by their records. The Indore grant[39] says that Vākpatirāja II, while residing at Ujjayinī in (*Vikrama*) *Saṁvat* 1031=974 A.D., after worshipping Bhavānīpati, granted the taḍāra named Pipparika, situated on the banks of the Narmadā, to the jñāna-vijñāna-saṁpanna Vasanta Ācārya, the son of Dhanika *Paṇḍit*, an emigrant from Ahicchatra.

Further, the Ujjain grant[40], dated V.S. 1036=980 A.D., states that Vākpatirāja II, while residing at Bhagavatpura, at the request of Āsinī, the wife of the Mahāsādhanika Mahāika, granted the village of Sembalapuraka, belonging to Tiṇisapadra-dvādaśaka, to the Bhaṭṭārikā Bhaṭṭeśvarī-devī at Ujjayinī.

That the Paramāra Vākpatirāja II alias Muñja was an independent ruler is evident from the fact that he does not

38. *I.A.*, XII, p. 265.
39. *Ibid.*, VI, pp. 48-53.
40. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 159-61

retain in his public documents even a formal recognition of the imperial Pratihāras. In addition, he assumes the full imperial titles of paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja and parameśvara[41].

The Rise of the Śāhis

The Pratihāra empire contracted in the north-west with the rise of the Śāhis whose kingdom extended 'in length from Sirhind to Lumghan and in breadth from the kingdom of Kāshmīra to Multan.'[42] At first the Śāhis had their seat of power at Udabhāṇḍapura or Waihind, but probably owing to the pressure of onward rush of the Muslim invaders, it was transferred to Bhaṭiṇḍā in the Punjab.

The Last Days

Rājyapāla (1018 A.D.)

The Pratihāra empire was attenuated by the time Rājyapāla succeeded Vijayapāla. The name of this monarch has been brought to light by the discovery of the Jhūsī grant of Trilocanapāla, dated V.S. 1084=1027 A.D., wherein we are told that he meditated on the feet of Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Parameśvara Vijayapāladeva.[43] Rājyapāla was perhaps a son of Vijayapāla, though from the expression '*pādānudhyāta*' used in the Jhūsī grant the exact relation between the two cannot be determined, for even youger brother is represented meditating on the feet of the older brother in the epigraphs. The disruptive forces which were already at work raised their sinister head and swept away the Pratihāras who had wielded power as imperial rulers at Kanauj for about two centuries. The invasion of Mahmūd of Ghaznī added fuel to the fire. The strong wind that blew in the wake of Mahmūd's invasion took off the sails of the Pratihāras and what was left was the carcass for the vultures to feast.

Mahmūd's Conquest of Kanauj

After the death of Subuktagin in 997 A.D., the sceptre of Ghaznī passed into the hands of his ambitious son Mahmūd.

41. *Ibid.*, VI, p. 51.
42. *Briggs*, Firishtā, I, p. 15.
43. *IA*, XVIII, p. 34.

After setting his kingdom in order, Mahmūd turned his attention towards Hindustan, and invaded the country as many as seventeen times during the years 1000—1026 A.D. The turn of Kanauj came in 1018 A. D. On the 13th *Junaidi* of 409 *Hijri* or 27th September, 1018 A.D., Mahmūd started from Ghaznī and crossed the Yamunā on the 20th day of *Rajab*, 409 *Hijri*, or 2nd December, 1018 A. D. He captured all the forts that blocked his way. The Rājā of Baran[44] (Bulandshahr) tendered his submission. The Sultān then measured swords with the chief of Mahāwan on the Yamunā[45]. The Hindus were defeated in a sharp engagement. The Rājā made an end of his life to escape humiliation. The Sultān now sacked Mathurā and destroyed its temples.

He proceeded afterwards to Kanauj and reached its gates on the 8th day of *Shaban* or 20th December, 1018 A.D. The city of Kanauj held a very strategic position on the right bank of the Gaṅgā. Rājyapāla, on hearing of Mahmūd's approach, fled across the Gaṅgā to Bari. The Sultān's forces were let loose to plunder. Enormous booty fell into the hands of the Sultan. Passing through the country of Bundelkhand, the Sultān returned to Ghaznī.

The Princes Arrayed against Rājyapāla

The cowardly flight of Rājyapāla gave offence to his fellow Rajput princes. The Candella chief Gaṇḍa[46] formed a confederacy with the neighbouring princes to punish Rājyapāla. The command was entrusted to the Candella crown-prince Vidyādhara. The Dubkund inscription records that the Kacchapaghāta Arjuna "being anxious to serve the illustrious Vidyādharadeva," slew Rājyapāla "with many showers of arrows that pierced his neckbone[47]." The Mahoba inscription commemorates that event by representing Vidyādhara as having 'caused the destruction of the king of Kānyakubja[48].' The Muslim historian Ibn-ul-Asir states that "Bidā (Vidyādhara) the accursed, who was the

44. *Elliot*, HI, II, p. 42, note 3.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 463 and note 1; Briggs, Firishtā, I, p. 63.
47. *EI*, II, pp. 233, 237, line 12.
48. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 210, 222.

greatest of the rulers of India in territory and had the largest armies, and whose kingdom was called Kajurāha (Khajuraho), sent messengers to the Ray of Kanauj named Rājaypāl (Rājyapāla) rebuking him for his flight and the surrender of his dominions to the Musulmans. Hostilities then broke out between them with the result that Rājaypāl was killed in the fight and most of his soldiers also perished[49]."

Mahmūd, who regarded the slain ruler as his vassal, resolved to punish the chiefs who had dared to defy his might.[50] He marched again in the autumn of A.D. 1019. When he reached the river Rahib[51] or Rāmagaṅgā he found Tarū Jaibāl or Tarū Jaypāl (Trilocanapāla), the son of the dead king, encamped on the opposite bank. He organised a surprise attack on the forces of Tarū Jaibāl and threw them in confusion. Bari lay prostrate at the feet of Mahmūd whose soldiers must have trampled it under their feet. Mahmūd now moved against the Candella ruler who was the nucleus for mustering forces against Rājyapāla. The Candella ruler collected a huge army to face Mahmūd. At first it appears that Mahmūd was scared by the strength of the Candella forces but the valiant invader summoned courage and offered prayers for his victory. The Candella ruler, as he lay encamped, is said to have become alarmed and fled away under the cover of darkness at night leaving the army and all munitions of war. Mahmūd had an easy victory and went round plundering the Candella camp. He pursued the Hindu army in forests and thickets and captured and put to sword a large number of them. The Candella ruler escaped and Mahmūd returned victorious to Ghaznī.

Trilocanapāla and His Successors

What happened to Trilocanapāla after Mahmūd's invasion is shrouded in mystery. His Jhūsī grant of the *Vikrama Saṁvat* 1084=1027 A.D. tells us that he had granted the village of Labhundaka in the Asurābhaka-viṣaya to the Brāhmaṇas of Prati-

49. Kamil-ut-Tawārikh (ed. Bulak), IX, p. 115 f.
50. Elliot, HI, II, p. 463.
51. According to Utbī the scene of the battle was the Rahib, but Nizāmuddīn and Firishtā place it on the Yamunā.

sthāna and he assumes the full imperial titles of paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja and parameśvara in the grant. It appears that he was ruling over the region of Prayāga as a sovereign. The discovery of the Kara[52] inscription of Yaśaḥpāla, who was perhaps a successor of Trilocanapāla, lends weight to the contention that the present district of Allahabad continued to be under the control of Trilocanapāla and Yaśaḥpāla. The Kara inscription records the grant of a village named Payalāsagrāma in the Kauśāmbī-maṇḍala in the (*Vikrama*) *Saṁvat* 1093 or 1036 A. D.

As regards Yaśaḥpāla's successors, we lack information. A king of Gādhipura (Kanauj) named Gopāla has been referred to in a stone inscription[53] found at Saheṭ-Maheṭh. This inscription was issued during the reign of Madana, whose minister Vidyādhara had established a monastery for the Buddhist monks. The inscription does not throw any light on the relation of Madana with Gopāla. The fact that Vidyādhara's father, Janaka, was Gopāla's minister may lend some colour to the view that they belonged to the same line and the one was succeeded by the other. The Badaun inscription[54] refers to one Madana and his father Gopāla in a list of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes ruling over Vodāmayuta which was not far off from Kanuaj. Perhaps Gopāla and Madana of the Saheṭ-Maheṭh inscription are identical with their namesakes of the Badaun record. Kanauj appears to have passed into the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes. They ruled over Kanauj till the last decade of the eleventh century A. D., when it was captured by Gahaḍavāla Candradeva.

52. *JRAS*, 1927, pp. 692-95.
53. *IA*, XVII, pp. 61-64.
54. *EI*, I, p. 61 f

CHAPTER VI

THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

Nature of the State

States were monarchical during the early mediaeval period of Indian history. The monarchs exercised despotic powers and except their immediate advisers, the people in general had no right to participate in their deliberations. The records bear testimony to the fact that their suzerainty was acknowledged by a number of feudatories (sāmantas), who very often assisted them in their campaigns and rendered them personal attendance when required. They obtained pañcamahāśabda[1] or the Rāja-paṭṭi, *i. e.*, the royal fillet or tiara[2] from their suzerain. The inscriptions generally bestow on them such titles as Mahāsāmantādhipati, Samadhigataśeṣamahāśabda, and Mahāpratihāra,[3] but sometimes they adopted the imperial titles of Mahārājādhirāja and Parameśvara, as did Mathanadeva of the Rājor inscription.[4] It was either due to varying degrees of dependence or attenuation of the imperial power. These feudatory chiefs do not seem to have been free from the central control. Their grants were countersigned by provincial representatives of the suzerain. The Partabgarh inscription[5] yields the information that the Cāhamāna prince Indrarāja, after having built a temple to the Sun-god (Indrādityadeva), applied to the provincial governor of Ujjayinī to make an endowment for its upkeep. The Una inscription informs us that Dhūka, who was perhaps a representative of Pratihāra Mahendrapāla I, approved of a grant made by the Mahāsāmanta Avanivarman II Yoga[6].

1. *EI*, IX, p. 1 f. (Una charter) ; *cf*. *IA*, V, pp. 251-52 ; *Ibid.*, XII, pp. 95-96 ; *EI*, XII, pp. 254-55; CII, III, p. 296, note 9, etc ; *JRAS* (G.B.), 1864, p. 280, fn. 1; *JAOS*, VI, p. 540.
. *EI*, IV, p. 130.
3. *Ibid.*, IX, pp.2 6.
. *bid.*, III, p. 266.
5. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 176-88.
6. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 2-6.

Head of the State

The office of the head of the state, the king, was hereditary. Al Mas'ūdi says that the royalty was limited to the descendants of one family and never passed to another[7]. Usually the choice fell upon the eldest son. Perhaps he was not recognised as a crown-prince (yuvarāja) till he was formally anointed as such. The heir-apparent was selected during the life-time of the ruling king, for the Arab traveller Sulaimān (851 A.D.) tells us that the princes in India named their own successors[8].

The king assumed the grandiloquent titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja and Parameśvara[9] which generally signify sovereign status. But sometimes the inscriptions apply the title of Mahārāja[10] or Śrīmat[11] to the names of even mighty rulers like Mihira Bhoja. Perhaps it was due to the fact that during the early mediaeval period 'titular formulas' were of extremely slight significance.[12] The king appears to have performed three functions, executive, judicial and military. He had no legislative power except to issue occasional Rājaśāsanas or royal edicts by way of administrative measures. The laws were already there, believed to be ordained and the king had merely to execute them. As the head of the executive, the king made high appointments, looked into the state finances, granted audience to envoys and collected secret information from spies. He appears to have been considered as the fountain of justice. The judges transacted business in the name of the king and the sentences passed by them were his sentences. People could make appeal to him and it was his duty to render them justice without delay. His decisions must have been final and inviolable. His military functions obviously included the command of the army in war. He seems to have deliberated over plans of offence and defence with his Mahāsenāpati (chief-commander) or Senāpati

7. Elliot, *HI*, I, p. 20.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
9. *EI.*, IX, p. 199.
10. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 18, line 6.
11. *Ibid.*, I, p. 156, line 6.
12. *JBBRAS*, XXI, pp. 409-10 ; *JRAS*, 1909, pp. 248-49; *EI*, XVIII, p. 90.

(commander of troops) and appointed high military officers. Medhātithi, who lived sometime in the ninth century A.D., says, "If the realm is invaded and its people are being massacred, one must die while fighting. If a king does not fight on such an occasion, he falls into a blind darkness."[13] The final voice of making war and peace rested with the king.[14]

The Chief Queen and the Crown-prince

Next to the king were the chief queen (Agra or paṭṭamahiṣī) and the crown-prince (Yuvarāja). The former perhaps received a handsome allowance for her maintenance and acted as a regent in case her husband expired leaving a minor to succeed him. She appears to have had some 'royal prerogatives' of granting land. Presumably her grant was to be sanctioned by the ruling king before it could take effect.

The Yuvarāja had the status of a Pañcamahāśabda Sāmanta and was invested with a necklace which was the insignia of his office. He held an honoured position in the realm. Like the chief queen he seems to have been invested with certain 'royal prerogatives' of granting villages and land. Probably his grants were also to be approved of by the king. When the ruling emperors were old and of a retiring or religious disposition, the heir-apparent perhaps exercised almost all powers of the ruling monarch. He usually stayed at the capital.

State Functionaries

The king was assisted by a number of functionaries to carry on the day-to-day government. The epigraphs refer to the following officials :—

(1) Mahāmantrin[15] or Chief Minister. He advised the king on matters of the state. The prefix 'mahā' indicates that he was the chief among other counsellors.

(2) Purohita or Chaplain. He assisted the king in the performance of rites and received gifts from him.

---

13. Medhātithi on Manu, VII, 90.
14. *Ibid.*, VII, 56.
15. *IA*, XVI, p. 177; Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjarī, pp. 12, 13, 18. In the Una charter the term Amātya occurs in the sense of a counsellor.

(3) Rājāmātya[16] or Minister of the king. He appears to be in close touch with the king and served as a link between the king and the council of ministers.

(4) Mahākumārāmātya[17] or Chief Minister of the heir-apparent.

(5) (Mahā) sāndhivigrahika[18] or Chief officer for peace and war, *i.e.*, foreign minister.

(6) Mahāsenādhipati[19] or Commander-in-Chief.

(7) Mahādaṇḍanāyaka[20] or Chief criminal judge.

(8) Mahāpratihāra[21] or Chief Usher or Lord Chamberlain.

(9) Mahāsāmanta[22] or Chief of the feudatories or the chief officer over the Sardārs.

(10) Mahākṣapaṭalika[23] or Chief Keeper of records. Akṣapaṭalika was his subordinate.

(11) Mahādharmādhyakṣa[24] or Chief Justice.

(12) Mahāmudrādhikṛta[25] or Great Mint-master.

(13) Mahābhogika[26] or Chief officer in charge of revenue.

(14) Dausādhasādhanika,[27] literally it means those charged with the accomplishment of what is difficult to accomplish. If this term is identical with 'dauhsādhika',[28] it may mean 'Policeman'.

---

16. *EI*, IV, p. 249.
17. *IA*, XXI, p. 256.
18. *EI*, II, p. 20.
19. *Ibid.*, I, p. 173.
20. *IA*, XXI, p. 256; *JASB*, XLVII, pt. I, p. 804.
21. *EI*, I, p. 173.
22. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 185.
23. *Ibid.*, I, p. 129.
24. *JASB*, XLIV, pt. I, p. 5.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
27. *EI*, IV, p. 250. *Ibid.*, I, p. 74; Mr. Wilkins calls him 'Chief obviator of difficulties'. See also Prof. Lassen's interpretation. *JASB*, XLIV, pt. I, pp. 5-6.
28. *See* A. Weber, Hala, 406, 537

(15) Daṇḍapāśika[29] or Policeman.

(16) Daṇḍoddharaṇika,[30] either a judicial officer, from daṇḍa in the sense of fine, or a Police-officer, from the same word in the sense of rod of chastisement.

(17) Cauroddharaṇika[31] or Officer entrusted with the pursuit of robbers.

(18) Daṇḍika or Jailor.

(19) Daśāparādhika[32], either investigator of crimes or magistrate entrusted with the punishment of ten offences[33].

(20) Dūtapreṣaṇika or Spies.

(21) Balādhikṛta[34] or Commandant.

(22) Balādhyakṣa[35] or Superintendent of the forces.

(23) Gaulmika[36], perhaps the head of the thirty foot-men.

(24) Cāṭabhaṭa[37] or irregular and regular soldiers.[38]

(25) Rājaputra[39] or Kṣatriya warriors related to the king.

(26) Yuktaka[40] or Accountant.

---

29. *EI*, XIX, p. 58; Mr Rajendralal Mitra translates it as 'keeper of the instrument of punishment. *JASB*, XLVII, pt. I, p. 804.
30. *EI*, IX, p. 5.
31. *IA*, XXI, p. 256.
32. *Ibid.*, *JASB*, XLVII, p. 804.
33. Ten offences are as follows: (a) Three offences of body, theft, murder, and adultery; (b) four offences of speech, harsh words, untruthful words, libellous words and pointless words; and (c) three offences of mind, coveting others' property, wrong thinking and devotion to what is not true.
34. *EI*, XIV, p. 185.
35. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 250.
36. *IA*, XXI, p. 256.
37. *EI*, IX, p. 5; Vogel, however, thinks that Cāṭa is equivalent to modern Car or "head of a parganā responsible for the internal management of a district, for the collection of revenue and the apprehension of criminals." According to the same scholar, bhaṭa, which is usually compounded with Cāṭa, should be taken to mean 'an official subordinate to the head of a parganā'. *ACS*, pt. I, pp. 131-32. Indraji translates the term as 'Cāṭān prati bhaṭaḥ, *i.e.*, soldiers against robbers. *IA*, IX, p. 175, note 41.
38. See, however, BG, I, pt. I, p. 81.
. *EI*, IV, p. 249.
40. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 5 ; *see*, however, Dr. Thomas' interpretation, *JRAS*, 1909, p. 467.

(27) Niyuktaka[41] or Deputy Accountant.

(28) Tantrapāla[42] or Charge d' affaires.

(29) Kāyastha or Karaṇika,[43] *i. e.*, the scribe. He was the writer of the records or legal documents.

(30) Bhāṇḍāgārika or Superintendent of the Stores.

(31) Antaḥpurika or Superintendent of the Seraglio.

(32) Antaraṅga,[44] servant of the interior or perhaps confidential servant.

(33) Bhiṣaka or the Physician. He took care of the health of the king and was perhaps the head of the Public Health Department.

(34) Naimittika or Astrologer. He forecast the effects of particular omens or conjunction of the stars. The king consulted him before any undertaking.

(35) Dūtaka[45] or Messenger.

(36) Dūta or Envoy. He was responsible for maintaining proper relation with the foreign powers.

(37) Ṣaṣṭhādhikṛta,[46] Superintendent or Comptroller of the ṣaṣṭhāṁśa or ṣaḍbhāga, *i.e.*, the sixth part of the produce due to the king.

(38) Hastyaśvagomahiṣyajāvikādhyakṣa[47] or Superintendent of elephants, horses, cows, buffalocows, goats and sheep.

(39) Naukādhyakṣa[48] or Superintendent of Boats.

(40) Daśagrāmika or officer in charge of groups of ten villages.[49]

---

41. *EI*, IX, p. 5; *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 256.
42. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 176.
43. *Ibid.*, I, p. 129.
44. *JASB*, XLIV, pt. I, p. 5.
45. *EI*, XIX, p. 18. Fleet remarks that "the Dūtaka's office was to carry, not the actual charter itself, for delivery into the hands of the grantees, but the king's sanction and order to the local officials, whose duty it was then to have the charter drawn up and delivered". *CII*, III, p. 100, note 3.
46. *EI*, IV, p. 249.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 250.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Ibid.*, fn. 11.

(41) Kṣetrapa[50] or Supervisor of Cultivators.

(42) Vāsāpakas[51] or officials whose duty it was to assign places of residence to strangers.

(43) Draṁgika[52] or officer in charge of town.

(44) Ākarādhikāra-puruṣas or officers in charge of mines.

(45) Kāryitā[53] or Overseer.

(46) Rājarājanaka[54] or Feudatory Chiefs.

Besides, there were state functionaries attached to the different administrative units. For administrative purposes the empire was parcelled into units known as bhukti or bhūmi, maṇḍala, viṣaya, agrahāra and grāma.

Provincial Administration

The province was called bhukti, as the Śrāvastī-bhukti in the Dighwa-Dubauli copperplate[55] and the Kānyakubja-bhukti in the Barah copperplate[56]; or bhūmi, as the Gurjaratrā-bhūmi in the Daulatpur copperplate.[57] It was put in charge of an officer designated as Rāṣṭrapati,[58] Rājasthānīya,[59] or Uparika-Mahārāja.[60] He was appointed by the central government. Some of

50. *IA*, XXI, p. 256.
51. *EI*, XII, p. 202; cf. *IA*, VII, p. 249; *Ibid.*, XII, p. 189, n. 38; *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 69, n. 31; *EI*, VI, p. 285.
52. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 5.
53. *Ibid.*, I, p. 247.
54. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 249.
55. *IA*, XV, p. 112.
56. *EI*, XIX, p. 18.
57. *Ibid.*, V, p. 211.
58. *IA*, XII, p. 193.
59. *EI*, IX, p. 5; Pt. Bhagwanlal Indraji considers this officer as 'foreign secretary', *BG*, I, pt. I, p. 82. According to Dr. Stein, this officer was equivalent to a modern Chief-justice. Rājataraṅgiṇī, trans. Bk. VII, p. 310, note. A better meaning would be a viceroy or governor, since in the Mandasor inscription, *CII* (No. 35) the term 'Rājasthāna' is used in the sense of a province.
60. *EI*, XV, pp. 114, 127, etc.

the provincial governors were members of the royal household and others were either feudatories, local chiefs or imperial officials. The governors had their own courts at their capitals which were replicas of the imperial court on a smaller scale. They enjoyed the status of Mahāsāmantas and bore the title of Rājā. It was left to them to settle the revenue of the villages and fields lying within their jurisdiction, for we learn from epigraphs that they were requested not to interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of the rent free lands and villages granted by the king.

Subordinate officers

The provincial governors were assisted by a number of subordinate officers. One such officer appears to be Vyavahārin[61] or controlling officer. He supervised the grants that were made by kings with a view to avoiding their falling into abeyance. Oparikāmātya was the minister attached to the governors. Dūtaka or messenger conveyed the orders of kings to them. The military forces were posted at strategic points for the defence of the provinces. The partabgarh inscription[62] informs us that Pratihāra Mahendrapāla II (946 A. D.) stationed one Śrīśarman as his commandant (Balādhikṛta) at Maṇḍapikā or Māṇḍū which was perhaps the military headquarters for the southern regions. Forts were built for provincial defence. They were placed in charge of officers called Koṭṭapāla[63] or guardian of fort. The Vaillabhaṭṭaswāmin (Gwalior) inscription says that a Nāgara Brāhmaṇa from Ānandapura in Gujarat (called Lāṭamaṇḍala in this epigraph) named Alla was appointed keeper of the Gwalior fort by Ādivarāha, *i.e.*, emperor Bhoja I of Kanauj, in recognition of his merits[64]. His father Vaillabhaṭṭa, who was in the service of Rāmadeva, is designated as Maryādādhurya or Dhurodhikārī[65], meaning chief of the boundaries. It was one of his functions to watch that the existing boundaries were not disturbed by any foreign power[66].

61. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 18.
62. *Ibid.*, XIX, pp. 180, 185-87.
63. *IA.*, XXI, p. 256.
64. श्रीमदादिवराहेण त्रैलोक्यविजिगीषुणा तद्गुणान्यः परिराप्य कृतो गोपाद्रि पालने । *EI*, *I*, p. 156.
65. *Ibid.*
66. Tripathi, *HKMC*, p. 340, fn. 2

Maṇḍala

Next to the bhukti was the maṇḍala. According to the Barah copperplate[67] these two terms were not synonymous. The head of the maṇḍala was Maṇḍaleśvara or Maṇḍalika.

Viṣaya (District)

The bhuktis were further divided into a number of districts called viṣayas such as Asurābhaka-viṣaya[68], Vālayikā-viṣaya,[69] Ḍeṇḍavānaka-viṣaya[70], and vārāṇasī-viṣaya[71]. The term bhoga[72] appears to have been used sometimes in the same sense. The viṣayas were in charge of officers known as viṣayapatis[73]. The head of the bhoga was called Bhogapati. It is very likely that the Viṣayapatis were appointed by the king. But the possibility of their being appointed by the provincial governor subject to the approval of the central authority cannot be ruled out, as we know from the Damodarapura copperplate of Kumāragupta, dated 443-44 A. D., that Cirātadatta, the governor of Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti, appointed Vetravarman as the Viṣayapati of Koṭivarṣa[74]. The office of the Viṣayapatis appears to be hereditary and they enjoyed the status of the feudatories (sāmantas). They were associated with a council of Viṣaya-mahattaras or notables. Subordinate to them were such officers as Daśāparā dhika, Cauroddharaṇika, Daṇḍika, Daṇḍapāśika, Daṇḍanāyaka, Saulkika (Collector of customs), Kṣetrapa (Supervisor of cultivators), Prāntapāla (Protector of boundaries of the state) and Koṭṭapāla. The Viṣayapatis appear to have exercised considerable revenue powers, since they are mentioned in copperplates among officers requested not to disturb the possession of the donees of lands or villages granted. They must have been responsible to the provincial governors (Rāṣṭrapatis) or the

67. *EI*, XIX, p. 18.
68. *IA.*, XVIII, p. 34.
69. *Ibid.*, XV, p. 112.
70. *EI.*, V, p. 211.
71. *IA*, XV, p. 141.
72. *EI*, III, p. 266.
73. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 249.
74. *Ibid.*, XV, p. 130; *see also Ibid.*, pp. 133, 142.

central government for the revenue of their districts Remission of taxes by subordinates probably required their sanction in order to be operative It cannot, however, be asserted whether they on their part referred the matter to their superiors before passing their own orders on the point. Their headquarters were perhaps called Adhiṣṭhāna or Pattana.

Agrahāra or Tahsīl

The viṣayas were subdivided into smaller units known as agrahāras[75] or tahsils. They consisted of a number of villages. Most probably the heads of the agrahāras, like the Viṣayapatis, were appointed by their immediate superior officers, *i.e.*, Viṣayapatis, subject to the approval of the provincial authority.

Grāma or Village

The grāma or village was the last administrative unit. It seems to have fixed sites and boundaries. The head of the grāma was called Grāmapati[76] or Gāmagāmika.[77] Such terms as Mahattara[78] and Mahattama[79] also occur in inscriptions. They were used either in the same sense or stood for associate officers varying in rank. The headman was perhaps appointed or recognised by the state. He must have been responsible to the government for the maintenance of peace and order within the pale of his jurisdiction. There is hardly any doubt that the king had the right of control and supervision.

The Grāmapati or headman administered the grāma with the assistance of a village council composed of the village elders. The council exercised considerable jurisdiction over the village disputes. It might have limited powers over criminal cases, but its civil jurisdiction as usual would have been unlimited. Owing to his position and status the headman must

---

75. *Ibid.*, Vol. XIX, p. 18. The Gahaḍavāla records use the term Pattalā for Tahsil.
76. *IA*, XII, p. 193.
77. *EI*, IV, p. 249.
78. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 5; BG, I, pt. I, p. 81.
79. *IA*, XVIII, p. 34.

have taken a prominent part in the meetings of the village council. He was village magistrate having powers to try petty criminal cases.[80] He organised Public Works Committees and raised funds for them by public subscriptions and by securing government contributions. He controlled and supervised the watch and ward arrangements. The village records, which were regularly kept, were also in his custody. The invariable mention of the village headman in the land and village grants shows that he was intimately connected with the revenue administration. He must have been remunerated for his services.

Another feature of the village administration was that persons who were the recipients of the rent free lands or villages had the right to try cases of ten offences and the privilege of grazing their cattle up to the limits of their villages. The officers were requested not to disturb the peaceful enjoyment of such villages or lands. These villages were free of forced labour of every kind and were granted with treasure-trove and other minor funds.[81]

Municipalities and Guilds

Some sort of municipal government was not unknown in the period under review. The Siyadoni inscription yields the information that the affairs of the town were managed by an assembly of five called 'Pañcakula' and by a committee of two, appointed from time to time by the town.[82] Every trade appears to have had its guild and no man could offend the guild with impunity. The *Vaillabhaṭṭa-swāmin (Gwalior) inscription* refers to such guilds, *viz.*, Tailika-śreṇī (the guild of oil-millers) and Mālika-śreṇī (the guild of gardeners).[83] These guilds had their heads known as Tailika-mahattaka and Mālikamahar[84] respectively. The Siyadoni and Pehoa inscriptions mention a number of traders such as oil-makers, stone cutters, betel-sellers, sugar-

80. *EI*, XI, pp. 244 ff.
81. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 5; *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 186.
82. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 170, 177.
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 160, 161.
84. *Ibid.*

boilers, potters, distillers of spirituous liquors[85] and horse-dealers,[86] who perhaps formed themselves into different corporations for regulating their business. These guilds must have developed a corporate life and law-abiding nature in members of various communities.

Fiscal Administration

Revenue was derived partly from taxation and partly from sources other than taxation. An appreciable portion of revenue was raised from the land. The principle governing this appears to have been that a fixed share of the produce of the land should be given to the state either in cash or in kind, preferably the latter. It was generally one-sixth of the produce. We are told by Alberūnī that one-sixth of the income made from the crops or from the cattle was to be paid to the ruler in recognition of the protection which he afforded to the subjects, their property and their families.[87]

The Village Lands

The village lands were measured by 'parameśvarīyahastas'[88] (royal yards) and 'nālukas' and were well demarcated by boundaries.[89] The state does not appear to have been the owner of the entire cultivable land in the kingdom. A conjecture may, however, be hazarded that it owned some pieces in most of the villages situated in the realm. These might have been lands lapsed to it as heirless property or confiscated by it for offences committed by their former owners or were actually purchased by it for state purposes. Some of these lands might have been waste lands brought under cultivation by the government. The produce of these domains was one of the sources of revenue to the state.

85. *Ibid.*, pp. 167-68, 174-78.
86. *Ibid.*, pp. 184-90.
87. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 149.
88. *EI*, I, p. 159.
89. *Ibid.*, V, pp. 113, 114. According to Alberūnī (Sachau, *AI*, I, p. 165), they had a measure called bīsī (? sibī); 4 bīsī = 1 prastha ; ¼ bīsī = 1 kuḍava.

Taxes

The state imposed such taxes as Udraṅga[90] (tax imposed upon the permanent tenants), Uparikara[91] (tax on cultivators who had no proprietary rights in the soil), and Bhāga[92] (share) upon the tenants and the land. The Rājor inscription[93] refers to such dues as Bhoga (enjoyment), Mayūta (not intelligible), Khala-bhikṣā (cess on threshing floors),[94] Prasthaka (perhaps a cess on each prastha of grain over and above the usual grain-share), Skandhaka (probably a cess at a certain rate per load) and Mārgaṇaka (possibly benevolences levied upon the villages).[95] The Una inscriptions[96] refer to Bhoga-bhāga, Hiraṇyadāna (possibly dues commuted into cash), Daśāparādhadaṇḍa (fines for ten offences), Collaka and other minor taxes. The list may be further supplemented by the contemporary records which refer to Kara (rent proper, payable in cash or kind), Jalakara (tax on water), Gokara (a tax on cattle), Viṣayadāna (some kind of district tax), Nidhinikṣepa (treasure-trove), Ākara (a tax on mines), Aputrikādāna (perhaps the crown's right to confiscate the property of one who dies sonless), and Naṣṭibharata (Naṣṭabharata ?)

Taxes Raised for Religious Purposes

Certain taxes, *viz.*, three viṁśopakas on every sack of agricultural produce brought for sale to the market, two pālikas on every ghaṭaka-kūpaka of clarified butter and oil, fifty leaves on every collikā (of leaves) brought from outside the town and two viṁśopakas per mensem on every shop, were imposed for religious purposes.[97]

90. *IA*, XIII, p. 78.
91. *Ibid.*; cf. C I I, III, p. 98.
92. *EI*, IX, p. 5, *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 184; cf. Gautama, X, 24-7; Manu, VIII, 130; Kauṭilya, V, 2.
93. *EI* III, pp. 264, 266.
94. cf. *Ibid.*, II, p. 179, verse 42. *See IA*, XVIII, p. 114, line 55 for khalaka as a revenue term.
95. Ghoshal, HRS, pp. 294, 296, 298, etc.
96. *EI*, IX, pp. 5, 10.
97. *EI*, III, pp. 264-66.

Revenue Accruing from Duties

Another source of revenue was trade. Duties were levied upon imports and exports, for we gather from contemporary records that there were regular customs-houses called Maṭṭadāva or Maṇḍapikā.[98] The collector of customs was called śaulkika.[99] It would not be wide of the mark to assume that the state also levied taxes on sales and manufactures. The exact scale of taxation adopted by the rulers of the period is not known. The Smṛti writers like Viṣṇu,[100] Gautama,[101] Śukra[102] and Baudhāyana,[103] *yield the information that it varied between* 5% and 10%.

Trade Transactions

The trade transactions[104] seem to have been carried on by barter, grain being the ordinary medium. But coins were not unknown. The Siyadoni inscription gives a list of them. The chief coin which it refers to was the silver dramma of Mihira Bhoja. It refers to several distinct kinds of drammas such as Dramma,[105] Pañciyaka-dramma,[106] Vigrahapāla-dramma,[107] Vigraha-pālīya-dramma,[108] Vigrahapāla-satka-dramma,[109] Vigrahatuṅgīya-dramma,[110] Śrīmadādivarāha-dramma,[111] Varāhakaya vimśopaka (?),[112] Vigraha-dramma visovaka,[113] Kapardaka,[114]

---

98. *Ibid*, I, p. 262.
99. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 250.
100. Viṣṇu, III, 30.
101. Gautama, II, 1, 26.
102. Śukra, IV, 2, 110.
103. Baudhāyana, I, 10, 15.
104. Elliot, *HI*, I, p. 4.
105. *EI*, I, p. 177, line 29.
106. *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 177, lines 6, 37.
107. *Ibid.*, p. 177, line 30.
108. *Ibid.*, p. 176, line 24.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 174, line 9.
110. *Ibid.*, p. 175, line 20.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 175, line 37.
112. *Ibid*, p. 174, line 10.
113. *Ibid.*, p. 176, line 26.
114. *Ibid.*, p. 175, line 20.

Kākinī and Varāṭaka.[115] The government must have had the monopoly to mint coins.

Mines and Forests

Other sources of revenue to the state treasury were mines[116] and forests. The mines were granted to corporations or individuals for fixed terms of lease and mining operations were carried out by licenses previously obtained. Forest-produce added to the revenue of the state.

Court Fees and Taxes on Prostitutes

The court fees and fines brought considerable sum to the state exchequer. Taxes were imposed upon prostitutes, for we are told by Alberūnī that the kings made harlots an attraction for their cities, a bait of pleasure for their subjects, for no other but financial reasons.[117] It is very likely that the government regulated gambling, which according to Ibn Khurdādba[118] was one of the sources of recreation, to raise its income.

Exactions

Exactions were made to meet the expenses of the regular and irregular military and police forces when they were quartered in a village while on march. It is not unlikely that the state levied extra taxes in case of emergency to tide over the difficulty.

Vishti

Contemporary records further refer to vishṭi or forced labour. It appears that the poor who could not pay tax to the state in cash were made to work for the state on certain occasions.

---

115. *Ibid.*, p. 179, line 45. *See* also *BG*, I, pt. I, p. 527; *JRAS*, 1909, p. 54, for Gadhiya or Gadhaiya coins.

16. Elliot, *HI*, Vol. I, p. 4.

117. Sachau, *AI*, Vol. II, p. 157.

118. Elliot, *HI*, Vol. I, p. 17.

Head of the Revenue Department

The revenue department was in charge of an officer called Mahābhogika. The prefix 'mahā' points out that he was the chief officer and there were subordinates to assist him. The revenue office was called Adhikaraṇa.

Dispensation of Justice

The king was the chief administrator of law and justice. The king did not exercise legislative power except the right to issue *rājaśāsanas* or royal edicts and interpret law. The sources of *Dharma* (law) were the Vedas, including the *Saṁhitās*, the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*; the *Smṛtis*, which are the conscientious recollections of the learned and the virtuous; *Ācāra*, the customary practice of the learned and the virtuous (but it was authoritative only when there was no Vedic and *Smṛti* text for or against it); and *Ātmatuṣṭi* (equity), *i.e.*, what satisfies the conscience of the learned and the virtuous.[119] Alberūnī informs us that the Hindus believed that their religious law and its single precepts derived their origin from *Ṛṣis*, their sages, the pillar of their religion, and not from the prophet, *i.e.*, Nārāyaṇa.[120] The king administered justice according to the laws approved of by the Hindu *Śāstras*. The petitioners cou d present their petitions to the king and it was his duty to mete out justice to them. The judgment of the king was supreme and inviolable.

Organisation of Judiciary

Next to the king were the civil and criminal courts to try cases. The kingdom was covered with a net-work of these courts. Our records refer to two officers-Mahādaṇḍanāyaka[121] and Mahādharmādhyakṣa.[122] The latter appears to have been the chief justice and the former was probably the chief criminal judge. We have no direct evidence as to the method of

---

119. Medhātithi on Manu, II, 2.6.
Sachau, *AI*, I, p. 106.
121. *IA*, XXI, p. 256 ; *JASB*, XLVII, pt. I, p. 804.
122. *Ibid.*, XLIV, pt. I, p. 5.

appointing these judges. They appear to have been appointed by the king. They must have been appointed because of their independence of character, great learning in the various branches of law, and impartiality.

In addition to these courts, there were popular courts as referred to by the Arab traveller Sulaimān.[123] Every village had perhaps its council which exercised both civil and criminal jurisdictions. It may safely be assumed that the parties, when they felt dissatisfied with the decision of such popular courts and the village council, appealed to the king or his courts for justice.

Court Procedure : Testimony of Alberūnī

According to Alberūnī,[124] when a certain case was filed the judge demanded from the suitor a document written against the accused person in a well-known writing which was thought suitable for writs of the kind, and in the document the well-stablished proof of the justice of his suit. In case there was no written document, the contest was settled by means of witnesses without a written document. The witnesses were not to be less than four, but there might be more. Perhaps a case was not dismissed on the plea of the absence of witnesses. If the suitor was not able to prove his claim, the defendant had to swear, but he might also tender the oath to the suitor by saying, 'swear thou that thy claim is true and I will give thee what thou claimest'. If the object was of no great importance, and the suitors agreed that the accused would swear, the latter simply swore before five learned Brahmins in the following words : 'If I lie, he shall have as recompense as much of my goods as is equal to the eightfold of the amount of his claim'. A high sort of oath was that the accused person was invited to drink the bish (visha ?) called brahmana (?). It was one of the worst kinds ; but if he spoke the truth, the drink did not do him any harm.

A still higher sort of ordeal was that they brought the man

123. *SS*, p. 61.

124. Sachau, *AI*, II, pp. 158-60.

to a deep and rapidly flowing river, or to a deep well with much water. Then he spoke to the water: 'Since thou belongest to the pure angels, and knowest both what is secret and public, kill me if I lie, and preserve me if I speak the truth'. Then five men took him between them and threw him into the water. If he had spoken the truth, he was not to drown and thus was saved. A still higher sort of ordeal was that the judge sent both claimant and defendant to the temple of the most venerated idol of the town or realm. There the defendant had to fast during that day. On the following day he dressed in new garments, and posted himself together with the claimant in that temple. Then the priests poured water over the idol and gave it to him to drink. If he, then, had not spoken the truth, he at once vomited blood. Besides this, the defendant was placed on the scale of a balance, and was weighed; whereupon he was taken off the scale, and the scale was left as it was. Then he invoked as witnesses for the truth of his deposition the spiritual beings, the angels, the heavenly being, one after the other, and all which he spoke he wrote down on a piece of paper, and fastened it to his head. He was a second time placed in the scale of the balance. In case he had spoken the truth, he now weighed more than the first time. There was a still higher sort of ordeal. They took butter and sesame-oil in equal quantities, and boiled them in a kettle. Then they threw a leaf into it, which by getting flaccid and burned was to them a sign of the boiling of the mixture. When the boiling was at its height, they threw a piece of gold into the kettle and ordered the defendant to fetch it out with his hand. If he had spoken the truth, he fetched it out. The highest kind of ordeal was that they made a piece of iron so hot that it was near melting, and put it with a pair of tongs on the hand of the defendant, there being nothing between his hand and the iron save a broad leaf of some plant, and under it some few and scattered corns of rice in the husks. They ordered him to carry it seven paces, and then he might throw it to the ground. If he was burnt, he was declared guilty.

Caste Considerations

Caste considerations were made at the time of imparting

justice. From Alberūnī we learn that the law of murder was that if the murderer was a Brāhmaṇa, and the murdered person a member of another caste, he was only bound to do expiation consisting of fasting, prayers and alms-giving. If the murdered person was a Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa murderer had to answer it in a future life; for he was not allowed to do expiation, because expiation wiped off the sin from the sinner, whilst nothing could wipe off any of the mortal crimes from a Brāhmaṇa, of which the greatest were . the murder of a Brāhmaṇa, called vajra-brahmahatyā ; further, the killing of a cow, the drinking of wine, whoredom, specially with the wife of one's own father and teacher. However, the kings did not for any of these crimes kill a Brāhmaṇa or Kṣatriya, but they confiscated his property and banished him from the country. If a man of a caste under those of the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya killed a man of the same caste he had to do expiation, but, besides, the king inflicted upon him a punishment in order to establish an example.

Law of Theft

The law of theft directed that the punishment of the thief was to be in accordance with the value of the stolen object. Accordingly, sometimes a punishment of extreme or of middling severity was necessary, sometimes a course of correction and imposing a payment, sometimes only exposing to public shame and ridicule. If the object was very great, the kings blinded a Brāhmaṇa and mutilated him, cutting off his left-hand and right-foot, or the right-hand and left-foot, whilst they mutilated a Kṣatriya without blinding him, and killed thieves of the other castes.[125]

Law of Inheritance

Alberūnī says that the chief rule of their law of inheritance was that the women did not inherit, except the daughter. She got the fourth part of the share of a son. If she was not married, the money was spent on her till the time of her marriage, and her dowry was bought by means of her share. Afterwards she

---

125. *Ibid*., p. 162.

had no more income from the house of her father. If a widow did not burn herself, but preferred to remain alive, the heir of her deceased husband had to provide her with nourishment and clothing as long as she lived. The son and grandson had a nearer claim to the inheritance than the ascendants, *i.e.*, the father and grandfather. The collateral relations, as, *e.g.*, the brothers, had less claims, and inherited only in case there was nobody who had a better claim. The son of a daughter had more claim than the son of a sister and that the son of a brother had more claim than either of them. If there were several claimants of the same degree of relationship, as, *e.g.*, sons or brothers, they all got equal shares. If the deceased left no heir, the inheritance fell to the treasury of the king,[126] except in the case that the deceased person was a Brāhmaṇa. In that case the king had no right to meddle with inheritance, but it was exclusively spent on almsgiving.[127]

Military Organisation

In the turmoil of the early mediaeval period of Indian history there was hardly a monarch who had not to undertake extensive military operations either to quell internal rebellions or to carry out ambitious foreign expeditions. The Pratihāras of Kānyakubja, the Pālas of Gauḍa and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa were at war with each other. The military machine of the empire must, therefore, have been very strong and efficient. We are told by the Arab traveller Sulaimān that the king of Jurz (Gurjara) maintained numerous forces and no other Indian prince had so fine a cavalry.[128] Al Mas'ūdi informs us that the Gurjara-Pratihāras used to maintain large army garrisons in the south and north, east and west, in order to deal promptly with the prospective attacks on all the fronts.[129] It seems that any corps could be summoned to any direction in times of difficulty.

The army appears to have been consisted of elephants,

126. cf. The Tax-Aputrikādāna, quoted above, p. 68.
127. Sachau, *AI*, II, pp. 164-65.
128. *Elliot*, HI, I, p. 4.
129. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

was lost by them owing to the revolt of the slaves in the household, who attacked them in the rear while the battle was at the critical stage.[134] Most probably women were not engaged for menial duties.

Recruitment of the Forces

The army, as usual, appears to have included a large number of Kṣatriyas. Perhaps other castes were not excluded. A part of the army consisted of the hereditary forces and the forces of the feudatories. The Muslim writers seem to be referring to the hereditary forces when they mention the troops of the Indian kings, who came out to fight for their king, though they received no pay from him.[135] The principle of heredity, which was allowed to operate to some extent in the appointments to civil offices, seems to have governed to a great extent the recruitment of the army as well. It is not unreasonable to assume that the hereditary force (Maula bala) was the most efficient and trustworthy arm. Perhaps most of the villages had their militias recruited from their own inhabitants. These militias might have been the principal recruitment fields for the regular armies. The recruits probably possesssed a certain amount of military efficiency at the time of their enrolment.

Officers of the Army

Most of the kings of the early mediaeval period were distinguished soldiers. Under them were a number of generals, who must have been in charge of the different corps. According to inscriptions, Mahāsenādhipati appears to have been the chief military officer over all the arms and in immediate communication with the king. The prefix 'mahā' indicates that there were subordinate officers like Senāpati for each arm. Other military officers were Balādhyakṣa (Superintendent of the forces), Balādhikṛta (Commandant) and Gaulmika[136] (perhaps the head

134. Elliot, *HI*, II, pp. 33-34.

135. *Ibid.*, I, p. 7.

136. IA, XXI, p. 256.

of thirty footmen). These officers must have been dressed in uniforms appropriate to their status in the army. The armies were generally distinguished from one another by special badges and banners.

Dūtapreṣaṇika

The army seems to have had a number of spies called Dūtapreṣaṇika. We are told by the Smṛti writers that they were the 'eyes and ears' of the king.[137] The king was expected 'to look through their eyes otherwise there were chances of his being tumbled down'. The Smṛti writers further compare them to the sun in energy and to the wind in movements. These spies must have been persons skilled in the interpretation of internal sentiments by conjecture and external gestures, accurate of memory, polite and soft in speech, agile in movements, capable of bearing up with all sorts of privations and difficulties, ready witted, and expert in everything. They were engaged not simply to gain information or to watch the movements of the enemy, but also for the purpose of sowing dissension, for capturing the enemy's fort, country or camp with the aid of weapons, poison or fire, for the purposes of most brutal assassinations of kings, chiefs of the army, leading citizens such as the councillors, as well as, for all purposes of devastation and cutting off the supplies of the enemy. Perhaps spies residing in enemy's country as traders sold poisoned liquors to soldiers. Under the garb of servants they might sell poisoned grass and water and thus kill the enemy's cattle, horses and elephants. Prostitute-spies might entice away young princes, chiefs of corporations, or of the army who perhaps paid the wages of their sin in the shape of ignominious death.

Lekhaka

Perhaps Lekhaka (scribe), who was a non-military officer, was attached to the military department. It is not unreason-

137. Kāmandaka, XII, 27.

able to suppose that his function was to keep the accounts relating to the military department. Most probably he was in possession of facts and figures as to the number of soldiers in different ranks of the army, the emoluments drawn by each, the number of discharged soldiers and the places where these latter were engaged.

Payment of Salary to the Army Personnel

The government appears to have paid the army regularly, for Medhātithi [138] lays down that the payment of salaries to civil servants and the army must be regular. Perhaps the government gave pensions to the dependents of soldiers killed in war.

Forts

The state built forts for the defence of the country. We may safely assume that the fortifications were of a varied character. Water, mountains[139], desert and forests must have served as defences. Of these water and mountain fortifications served best as defences for centres thick with population, whilst the other kinds, the desert and forest fortifications were intended to ward off dangers arising from unknown wilds and woods. The forts were placed in charge of officers called Koṭṭapāla.

Actual Warfare

The king seems to have led the host in person to the battle-field assisted by the Commander-in-Chief (Mahāsenādhipati). In fact, in ancient times that was considered the chief duty of a king. We may assume that the kings were usually in the van as they were expected to set an example for their soldiers. It is difficult to understand the manner of fighting in vogue in those days, when the gun had no existence. Perhaps the bowmen began the fight. The king probably rode on an elephant and fought with his bow. The most terrible fighting appears to have been with the elephant force and the inscriptions of our period almost always extol the king's valour in attacking black masses of ele-

---

138. Medhātithi on Manu, VII, 60.

139. *EI*, XVIII, p. 103.

phants and breaking their temples with the blows of swords. The death of the king or the Commander on the battlefield almost always led to the defeat and the rout of his army. Historians of Mahmūd of Ghaznī refer to swords, spears, bows, arrows and maces as the weapons used by the opposing Hindu forces.[140] We may, therefore, conclude that these must have been the weapons mainly used by the armies of our period.

Ethics of War

We are told by Medhātithi that 'if a war is declared, there should be no weakening. There should be no hesitation as to whether a weak enemy should be attacked or not. The king should not try to be consistent. He should uproot the weeds.'[141] He further tells us that mere submission of the vanquished is immaterial. The enemy is to surrender completely.[142] The *rājakula* or royal family of the fallen prince does not appear to have been extinguished, for we learn from the Arab traveller Sulaimān that 'when a king subdues a neighbouring state, he places over it a man belonging to the family of the fallen prince, who carries on the government in the name of the conqueror.'[143] According to Medhātithi, 'the victor should summon assemblies of the cities and the country-side and they must decide the manner in which they are to be ruled.'[144] We may thus conclude that humanity triumphed over the desire of revenge. The non-warring elements do not appear to have been always interfered with. Medhātithi says that 'when a king attacks his enemy, he really attacks the government—the political machinery. He has no business to destroy the inhabitants of the enemy's realm, if it is possible to spare them'.[145]

Perhaps the use of invisible arms and poisonous or fire emitting weapons was also forbidden. The early *Smṛti* writers[146] lay

---

140. Elliot, *HI*, II, p. 30.
141. Medhātithi on Manu, VII, 88 ; *Ibid.*, VII, 11.
142. *Ibid.*, VII, 92.
143. Elliot, *HI*, I, p. 7.
144. Medhātithi on Manu, VII, 201, 202.
145. *Ibid.*, VII, 32 ; *See*, however, Altekar, *RTT*, pp. 257-59.
146. *See* Baudhāyana, I, 10, 18.

down that the timid, the intoxicated, the insane, the negligent, the unprepared, women, children, the aged and the Brāhmaṇas were not to be attacked. It may be presumed that the kings of the period under review also followed these principles in their exploits.

Police

The state appears to have maintained a strong police force to afford security to the civil population. Sulaimān says that there was no country in India more safe from robbers than Jurz.[147] The police officials were obviously the instruments for bringing to book law-breakers. The police officers were called Cauroddharaṇika and Daṇḍapāśika. Crimes, that could not be locally detected, were investigated by these officers. It is very likely that they worked under the direction of the Rāṣṭrapatis and Viṣayapatis who could perhaps afford military assistance to them in case it was necessary for apprehension of desperate robbers or dacoits. Most probably much of the police control was by means of spies (Dūtapreṣaṇika), who sometimes acted as agents *provocateures.*

The policing arrangements of villages appear to have been under the supervision of the headmen. Perhaps the village watchman was in immediate charge of the work, and it was his duty to detect all crimes. We may presume that if a theft or robbery was committed within his jurisdiction, he had to find out the culprit. If the latter remained untraceable, the watchman had perhaps to compensate for the loss. It would not be wide of the mark to imagine that his liability was limited by his means and it was based on a shrewd suspicion that he might be a party to the theft committed. The king might have made good the loss out of his treasury, if full compensation for the stolen goods could not be exacted from the watchman.[148]

Public Works Department

Probably the government had also set up a department like the modern Public Works Department to regulate

147. Elliot, *HI*, I, p. 4.

148. Viṣṇu says that if the king is unable to recover stolen goods, he must pay their value out of his treasury. Viṣṇu, III, 67.

the administration of the means of communication, irrigation and things of similar nature which were mostly of daily use. The means of communication were kept in good order and protected against brigands and other high-waymen for trade and commerce. The kings had to wage war more often than never, hence special attention must have been paid to the means of communication The government appears to have made proper arrangements for irrigation. The Partabgarh inscription of Mahendrapāla II refers to a leather bucket (koṣa) which was used for irrigating fields. Perhaps sluices were constructed and the officers were deputed to look after them so that everybody might utilize them in a fair way. The peasants were treated equally. They could have water for irrigation from taṛāgas (tanks), saritās (rivers) and kūpas (wells).

Public Health Department

Perhaps the government ran a department like the modern Public Health Department to look after the public health and hygiene. The *Dharma-Sūtras* and the *Dharma-śāstras* agree in general to the various regulations for maintaining public health in towns. Healthy regulations must have been laid for the sale of food commodities. The committing of nuisance in public roads and in sacred spots, such as rivers, temples, shady places, before fire and women, was punishable. The curative arrangements were perhaps made both for men and animals. Various measures must have been undertaken to ward off diseases. The Bhiṣaka (physician) appears to be the head of the Public Health Department.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL SET-UP

Organisation of Society : Ascendency of Brāhmaṇas

The Hindu Society was composed of the usual four varṇas, *viz.*, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. The Brāhmaṇas had gained complete ascendency in the society. Al Mas'ūdi[1] and Alberūni[2] bear out that the Brāhmaṇas were honoured by the Indians as forming the most noble and illustrious caste. The Brāhmaṇas seem to have formed one caste throughout India without any sub-divisions based on provincial or other minor differences. Thus we do not find Brāhmaṇa donees in inscriptions described as Kānyakubja, Mālavīya, Saryūpāreṇa, Maithila, Gauḍa or Draviḍa. The records distinguish them by their *gotras* and *pravaras*. Among the former they mention : Kāsyapa, Kātyāyana, Bhāradvāja, Vatsa, Gobhila, Bandhula, Vaśiṣṭha, Śarkarākṣa, Pārāvasa, Gautama, Śāṇḍilya, Kauśika, Sāṁkṛtya, Kṛṣṇātreya, Upamanyu, Kauṇḍinya, Kapisthala, Bhārgava, Pārāśara, Jīvantyāyana, Garga, Gārgya, Sāvarṇa, Dhaumya, Sausravasa, Gālava, Kūtsa, Sārkara, Dakṣa, Jātukarṇa, Candrātreya, Gauṇya, Pippalāda, Harita, Maunya, Darbha, Agasti, Maudgalya, Kaṇva, Ātreya, etc.[3] ; and the latter are referred to as follows : Viśvāmitra, Ambarīṣa, Bhārgava, Jāmadagna, Bārhaspatya, Bhāradvāja, Kauśika, Dhaumya, Gautama, Bandhula, Aghamarṣaṇa, Gobhila, Āngirasa, Cyāvana, Aurva, Apnavāna, Maudgalya, Kāsyapa, Bharmyāśva, Āvatsara, Naidhruva, Kāṅkāyana, Audalya, Aitatha, Avitatha, Devarāta, etc.[4].

Characteristic Names

Besides these *gotras* and *pravaras*, the Brāhmaṇas seem to have characteristic names according to their occupations and modes of life. Alberūnī says that "the Brahman is in general called by this name as long as he does his work staying at home. When he is busy with the service of one fire, he is called ishṭin ; if he serves three fires, he is called agnihotrin ; if he besides offers an offering to the fire, he is called dīkṣita"[5]. In addition, the contemporary records refer to such Brahmanic surnames as Miśra[6], Dvivedin[7], Tripāṭhin or Tripāṭhī[8], Śarman[9], Avasthī[10], Caturvedin[11] or Caturvaidya[12] and the title *paṇḍit*.

Life of a Brāhmaṇa : Alberūnī's Account

"The life of the Brahman, after seven years of it have passed, is divided into four parts. The first part begins with the eighth year, when the Brahmans come to him to instruct him, to teach him his duties, and to enjoin him to adhere to them and to embrace them as long as he lives. Then they bind a girdle round his waist and invest him with a pair of Yajñopavītas, *i.e.* one strong cord consisting of nine single cords which are twisted together, and with a third Yajñopavīta, a single one made from cloth. This girdle runs from the left shoulder to the right hip. Further, he is presented with a stick which he has to wear, and with a seal-ring of certain grass, called darbha, which he wears on the ring-finger of the right hand. This seal-ring is called pavitra. The object of his wearing the ring on the ring-finger of his right hand is this, that it should be a good omen and blessing for all those who receive gifts from that hand. The obligation of wearing

5. Sachau, *Al*, I, p. 102.
6. *IA*, XIV, p. 207.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 208
9. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 123.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 220
11. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 201.
12. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 51

the ring is not quite so stringent as that of wearing yajñopavita, for from the latter he is not to separate himself under any circumstances whatever. If he takes it off while eating or fulfilling some want of nature, he thereby commits a sin which cannot be wiped off save by some work of expiation, fasting or almsgiving.

"This first period of the Brahman's life extends till the twenty-fifth year of his age, or, according to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, till his forty-eighth year. His duty is to practise abstinence, *to make the earth his bed, to begin with the learning of the Veda* and of its explanation, of the science of theology and law, all this being taught to him by a master whom he serves day and night. He washes himself thrice a day, and performs a sacrifice to the fire both at the beginning and end of the day. After the sacrifice he worships his master. He fasts a day and he breaks fast a day, but he is never allowed to eat meat. He dwells in the house of the master, which he only leaves in order to ask a gift and to beg in not more than five houses once a day, either at noon or in the evening. Whatever alms he receives he places before his master to choose from it what he likes. Then the master allows him to take the remainder. Thus the pupil nourishes himself from the remains of the dishes of his master. Further, he fetches the wood for the fire, wood of two kinds of trees, palasa (Butea frondosa) and darbha, in order to perform the sacrifice; for the Hindus highly venerate the fire, and offer flowers to it. It is the same case with all other nations. They always thought that the sacrifice was accepted by the deity if the fire came down upon it, and no other worship has been able to draw them away from it, neither the worship of idols nor that of stars, cows, asses, or images. Therefore Bashshar Ibn Burd says: 'Since there is fire, it is worshipped'.

"The second period of their life extends from the twenty-fifth year till the fiftieth, or according to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, till the seventieth. The master allows him to marry. He marries, establishes a household, and intends to have descendants, but he cohabits with his wife only once in a month after she has become clean of the menstruation. He is not allowed to marry a woman above twelve years of age. He gains his sustenance

either by the fee he obtains for teaching Brahmans and Kṣatriyas, not as a payment but as a present, or by presents which he receives from some one because he performs for him the sacrifices to the fire, or by asking a gift from the kings and nobles, there being no importunate pressing on his part, and no unwillingness on the part of the giver.........

"The third period of the life of the Brahman extends from the fiftieth year to the seventy-fifth, or according to Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, till the ninetieth. He practices abstinence, leaves his household, and hands it as well as his wife over to his children, if the latter does not prefer to accompany him into the life of wilderness. He dwells outside civilization, and leads the same life again which he led in the first period. He does not take shelter under a roof, nor wear any dress but some bark of a tree, simply sufficient to cover his loins. He sleeps on the earth without any bed, and only nourishes himself by fruit, vegetables, and roots. He lets the hair grow long, and does not anoint himself with oil.

"The fourth period extends till the end of life. He wears a red garment and holds a stick in his hand. He is always given to meditation; he strips the mind of friendship and enmity, and roots out desire, and lust, and wrath. He does not converse with anybody at all. When walking to a place of particular merit, in order to gain a heavenly reward, he does not stop on the road in a village longer than a day, nor in a city longer than five days. If any one gives him something, he does not leave a remainder of it for the following day. He has no other business but that of caring for the path which leads to salvation, and for reaching mokṣa, whence there is no return to this world"[13].

Universal Duties of a Brāhmana

Alberūnī further informs us that "the universal duties of the Brahman throughout his whole life are works of piety, giving alms and receiving them. For that which the Brahmans give reverts to the pitras (in reality a benefit to the Fathers). He must continually read, perform the sacrifices, take care of

13. Sachau, Al. II, pp. 130-33.

the fire which he lights, offer before it, worship it, and preserve it from being extinguished, that he may be burned by it after his death".[14]

Perhaps the Brāhmaṇas had the liberty to take to the profession of the lower castes, besides those that were theoretically permitted to them. But there were certain moral restrictions, for Alberūnī says that "every man who takes to some occupation which is not allowed to his caste, *e.g.*, a Brahman to trade, a Śūdra to agriculture, commits a sin or crime, which they consider only a little less than the crime of theft".[15]

The Brāhmaṇas seem to have filled various offices of the state. They occupied high as well as low rank. We are told in the Vaillabhaṭṭaswāmin (Gwalior) inscription that a Nāgar Brāhmaṇa named Alla was appointed keeper of the Gwalior fort by Bhoja[16] I of Kānyakubja. Some of our records refer to Purohita, who was a Brāhmaṇa and assisted the king in the performance of rites and received gifts from him.[17] But the Brāhmaṇas appear to have kept the van in the profession of learning. Abū Zaid informs us that "among the Indians there are men who are devoted to religion and men of science, whom they call Brahmans. They have also their poets who live at the courts of their kings, astronomers, philosophers, diviners, and those who draw omens from the flight of crows, etc. Among them are diviners and jugglers, who perform most astonishing feats. These observations are specially applicable to Kanauj, a large country forming the empire of Jurz".[18]

The Kṣatriyas

Next to the Brāhmaṇas were the Kṣatriyas. They seem to have formed one caste, for we are told by the merchant Sulaimān that "in all these kingdoms the nobility is considered to form but one family"[19]. Perhaps the Kṣatriyas did not refer to their *gotras* during the period under review. The

14. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
16. *EI*, I, p. 157.
17. *JUG*, III, p. 108.
18. Elliot, *HI*, Vol. I, p. 10.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

inscriptions of the Pratihāras nowhere refer to their *gotra*. Kula seems to have been used for *gotra*[20]. It was perhaps due to the fact that the Vedic rituals and sacrifices were now not in vogue with the Kṣatriyas and the worship of the Paurāṇic deities became supreme. The former required the recital of *gotra* and *pravara*, while the latter did not. Though their usual occupation was that of arms, there was no dearth of the Kṣatriyas devoted to letters. According to Alberūnī[21], they could read and learn the Vedas but they were not permitted to teach them.

The Vaiśyas

The Vaiśyas ranked third in the society. They too formed one caste throughout India, for we do not run across the names of their modern sub-divisions. Alberūnī tells us that the duty of the Vaiśyas was "to practise agriculture and to cultivate the land, to tend the cattle and to remove the needs of the Brahmans"[22]. But the Vaiśyas had probably long given up agriculture under the influence of Buddhism. The Buddhists believe that agriculture is sinful because it requires the cutting of the ground and thus involves the killing of various insects. The Vaiśyas were generally described as artificers and domestics[23]. They were losing their position among the traivarṇikas, for Alberūnī says that the Vaiśyas were not allowed to hear the Vedas, much less to pronounce and recite them. If such a thing could be proved against one of them, the Brāhmaṇas dragged him before the magistrate, and he was punished by having his tongue cut off[24].

The Śūdras

The lowest among the Varṇas were the Śūdras. Alberūnī gives the following account of their life : "The Śūdra is like a servant to the Brahman, taking care of his affairs and

20. *EI*, IX, p. 200.
21. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 136.
22. *Ibid*.
23. Elliot, *HI*, I, p. 16.
24. Sachau, *AI*, I, p 125.

serving him. If, though being poor in the extreme, he still desired not to be without a yajñopavīta, he girds himself only with the linen one. Every action which is considered as the privilege of a Brahman, such as saying prayers, the recitation of the Veda, and offering sacrifices to the fire, orbidden to him"[25]. He further informs us that if a Śūdra was proved to have recited the Veda he was punished like the Vaiśyas[26]. According to Medhātithi, Śūdra was entitled to perform pāka-yajña and religious sacrifices like prakaraṇa-śrāddha, Aṣṭaka and Vaśvadeva[27].

The Antyajas

Alberūnī refers to one more class of people called Antyaja after the Śūdras. He says that the Antyajas rendered various kinds of services, and were not reckoned among the castes but only as members of a certain craft or profession. There were eight classes of them, who freely intermarried with each other, except the fuller (washerman), shoemaker, and weaver, for no others condescended to have anything to do with them. These eight guilds were the fuller, shoemaker, juggler, the basket and shield maker, the sailor, fisherman, the hunter of wild animals and birds, and the weaver. The four Varṇas did not live with them in one and the same place. These guilds lived near the villages and towns of the four castes but just outside them[28].

Hāḍī, Ḍoma, Caṇḍāla and Badhatau (sic)

Alberūnī[29] in his accounts also refers to the people called Hāḍī, Ḍoma (Domba), Caṇḍāla and Badhatau (sic). They were not reckoned among any class or guild. They were occupied with dirty work, like the cleansing of the villages and other services. They were considered as one sole class, distinguished only by their occupations In fact, they were considered like illegitimate children, for according to general opinion they

25. *Ibid.*, II, p. 136.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Medhātithi on Manu, III, 67 , *Ibid.*, X, 127.
28. Sachau, *AI*, I, p. 101.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

descended from a Śūdra father and a Brāhmaṇa mother as the children of fornication, and, therefore, they were degraded outcasts.

The Seven Classes of Ibn Khurdādba

Ibn Khurdādba,[30] who died in 912 A.D., refers to seven classes of the Hindus, namely Sābkufria, among whom were men of high caste, and from among whom kings were chosen; Brahma, who totally abstained from wine and fermented liquors; Katariya, who drank not more than three cups of wine; the daughters of the class of Brahma were not given in marriage to the sons of this class, but the Brahma took their daughters; Sūdariyā, who were by profession husbandmen; Baisurā, who were artificers and domestics; Sandālia, who performed menial offices; and Lahūd, who were fond of amusements and games of skill. It is quite obvious from these details that Brahma, Katarīya, Sūdariyā, Baisurā, Sandālia and Lahūd are the same as Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Śūdras, Vaiśyas, Caṇḍalas and Bāzīgars and itinerant jugglers. The first term—Sābkufria, is unintelligible. But as kings were chosen from this class, we may fairly identify it with the Kṣatriya class. Perhaps he used this term to distinguish the members of the royal families from amongst whom the kings were chosen from the Kṣatriyas in general. Al Idrisi[31], who was born towards the end of the eleventh century A.D., also refers to the seven classes of the Indians. These classes, with little variation in spellings, are almost identical with the classes mentioned by Ibn Khurdādba. The seventh class, of course, differs in name from the seventh one of Ibn Khurdādba. Al Idrīsī refers to the seventh class as Zakya and not Lahūd. But both of them agree with regard to the profession of the members of this class. The profession of Lahūd and Zakya is common. This leaves no room for doubt that they were identical.

The Kāyasthas

The Kāyasthas (scribes) were known to the Indian records

30. Elliot, *HI*, I, pp. 16-17.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 76.

from the days of the Guptas. During the early mediaeval period they are mentioned in the inscriptions. Perhaps they formed a caste of their own. Their sub-divisions are not found during the period under review.

Sulaimān's Reference

The Arab traveller Sulaimān refers to one class of people who wandered in the woods and mountains and rarely communicated with the rest of mankind. Some of them went naked. Others stood naked with face turned to the sun, having nothing on but a panther's skin[32]. These people may have been those who renounced the world and led the life of a recluse. It may correspond to the third or fourth stage (āśrama) in which the Hindu life was divided. Their standing with face turned towards the sun may speak for the mode in which they worshipped the sun.

Social Intercourse

These various classes of people seem to have begunto entertain a feeling of distinction in their social intercourse. We learn from Alberūnī[33] that each of the four principal varṇas or castes when they sat to dine formed a group for themselves, one group not being allowed to comprise two men of different varṇas. He further says that if a Brāhmaṇa ate in the house of a Śūdra for sundry days, he was expelled from his caste and could never regain it[34]. As regards social relations between the Muslims and the Hindus, Alberūnī says that no drinking or eating with the Mlecchas was permitted in his time[35]. He was repeatedly told that when the Hindu slaves in Muslim countries escaped and returned to their country and religion, they were admitted after an expiation, but when he inquired from the Brāhmaṇas whether this was true, they denied it, maintaining that there was no expiation possible

32. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
33. Sachau, *AI*, I, p. 102.
34. *Ibid.*, II, p. 163.
35. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 19-20.

for such individuals.[36] It is thus clear that the masses had swung themselves on the side of reconversion but the orthodoxy was frowning at the practice.

Marriage

The caste does not appear to have been so rigid during the period under review as it is at present. The accounts of the Muslim travellers bear out that the anuloma marriages were permitted during the early mediaeval period. Ibn Khurdādba[37] says that the Brāhmaṇas could marry the Kṣatriya girls. Alberūnī[38] testifies to the practice when he says that every man of a caste might marry a woman of his own caste or one of the castes or caste below his. Their accounts are borne out by the fact that the founder of the Pratihāra dynasty, Haricandra, who was a Brāhmaṇa, had a Kṣatriya wife[39]. The *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara also refers to such anuloma marriages. Rājaśekhara, who was a Brāhmaṇa, had married a Kṣatriya lady named Avantisundarī[40]. But such marriages seem to have begun to fall into disrepute. We learn from Alberūnī[41] that the Brāhmaṇas, though they were allowed to marry in other castes, never married any woman except one of their own caste. Medhātithi[42] lays down that the Brāhmaṇa or Kṣatriya bridegroom in the tenth stage of his life should not marry a Śūdra girl even when she is extremely beautiful.

Restrictions on Marriage

The pratiloma marriages were not allowed. Alberūnī[43] says that nobody was allowed to marry a woman of a caste superior to his own. Ibn Khurdādba also refers to such restrictions

36. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 162-63.
37. *See* ante, p. 90.
38. Sachau, *AI*, II, pp. 155 56.
39. EI. XVIII, p. 95.
40. Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjarī (ed. D. Prasad & K.P.P.), p. 10.
41. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 156.
42. Medhātithi on Manu, II, pt. I, p. 38 (trans. Ganganath Jha).
43. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 156.

when he points out that the daughters of the class of Brahma (Brāhmaṇa) were not given in marriage to the sons of the Katarīya (Kṣatriya) class[44].

There were other restrictions which were to be respected by the members of the Hindu society. According to Medhātithi[45], the Brāhmaṇas should not establish uterine (the giving and taking of daughters in marriage) relationship with the Vrātyas until they were duly purified. We learn from Alberūnī[46] that it was absolutely forbidden to marry related women both of the direct descending line, *viz.*, a granddaughter, or great-granddaughter, and of the direct ascending line, *viz.*, a mother, grandmother, or great-grandmother. It was also forbidden to marry collateral relations, *viz.*, a sister, a niece, a maternal or paternal aunt and their daughters, except in case the couple of relations who wanted to marry each other were removed from each other by five consecutive generations. In that case the prohibition was waived, but, notwithstanding, such a marriage was an object of dislike to them.

Early Marriages

Early marriages appear to have come in vogue. Alberūnī[47] informs us that the Hindus married at a very young age. A Brāhmaṇa was not allowed to marry a woman above twelve years of age[48]. The Smṛtis like those of Parāśara and Vyāsa prescribe marriage for girls from eight to ten years of age.

Polygamy

Polygamy seems to have been prevalent. Alberūnī[49] testifies to the practice when he says that a man might marry one to four wives. It was common with the royal families to take more than one wife. It is not unlikely that the polygamy was practised by the rich and ruling sections of the society and the poor found it beyond their means.

44. *See ante*, p. 90.
45. Medhātithi on Manu, I. pt. II. p. 283 (trans. Ganganath Jha).
46. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 155.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 131.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 155.

Divorce not Permitted

Ties of wedlock were held sacred and indissoluble. Alberūnī bears out the practice. He says that husband and wife could only be separated by death as they had no divorce[50]. In fact, the marriage has been regarded as an indissoluble tie since the days of the Vedas, the early dawn of the Hindu culture. The concept has been upheld through all the ages and even to-day, in spite of the legislation permitting divorce, it has not lost its importance.

Widow Marriage Prohibited

There is no reference to widow marriage during the period under review. Alberūnī[51] categorically says that a widow could not remarry herself. Even *levirate (niyoga)* was becoming unpopular, for Medhātithi[52] points out that though sanctioned by the *Smṛtis*, it was deprecated by the people.

Satī

Some of the later *Smṛti* writers[53] refer to the *Satī* custom. They, however, do not[54] hold it as an ideal practice. They prefer the ascetic life to self-immolation. Bāṇa, who was the greatest literary ornament of the court of Harṣa of Kanauj, has vehemently criticised the practice in the *Kādambarī*. Medhātithi[54] also felt that no purpose was served by burning oneself with the dead body of one's husband. The *Tantra* writers[55] were averse to the practice. Their criticism, however, could not produce any effect. The custom continued to gain ground. We are told by Alberūnī[56] that the wives of the dead kings were burnt with them. An exception was made only for women of advanced years and for those who had

---

50. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
52. Medhātithi on Manu, II, pt. II, p. 441 (trans. Ganganath Jha).
53. Pārāśara *Smṛti*, IV, 26-28.
54. Medhātithi on Manu, V, 156.
55. *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*, X, 79-80.
56. Sachau, *AI*, II, p. 155.

children. It cannot, however, be pointed out with precision as to whether the practice was confined to the royal families or it had filtered down to the masses. As it was an orthodox practice and in later centuries it was practised with all its nakedness, it will not be wide of the mark to conclude that it was practised by all and sundry.

Purdā

Another system which seems to have prevailed in the Hindu society was *purdā*. It is, indeed, strange that Abū Zaid[57] records that "most of the princes of India when they hold a court allow their wives to be seen by the men who attend it, whether they be natives or foreigners". This might have been true of the South, for there was no *purdā* with them. It cannot apply to the courts of the princes of Northern India, for *purdā* prevailed in the North from of old. However, it may be pointed out that there was no absolute bar for women to appear in public. On festive occasions like fairs (*melas*) and at the time of religious ceremonies organised on village basis and the like, it is not very unlikely that women appeared in public and took part as it is marked even to-day.

Dress

The clothing both of men and women consisted, as of old, of one piece of cloth bound about the loins, and taken up above one shoulder in the case of men and above both in that of women. The *uttarīya* or the second or upper piece of cloth seems to have been used by both men and women[58]. Rājaśekhara gives an interesting description of the dress of the women of Kānyakubja in the following words: "With ear-rings dancing on the cheeks and with the long necklace moving, down to the navel, the dress of the women of Kanauj deserves to be honoured, their upper cloth going completely round the waist down to the anklet"[59]. He further informs us that

57. Elliot, *HI*, I. p. 11.

58. Rājaśekhara, *Karpūramañjarī* (ed. Durga Prasad and K. P. P.), p. 106.

59. Rājaśekhara, *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* (ed. C. D. Dalal and R. A. K. Shastry). p. 8.

anklets[65], kuṇḍala[66], necklace[67] and bracelets[68].

Cosmetics

Women decorated their feet[69] and bodies[70]. A stanza in the *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara introduces us to the use of toilet. Its substance is as follows : "Toilet does not effect any improvement to a lady's full round breasts, her wide eyes, lovely face and her body ; or, in other words, it puts things in disadvantage ; for example, clothes will cover the charming breasts, collyrium will put a black mark around the eyes, the natural grace of the face will be covered by the powder and the beautiful formation of the body will be obscured by garments, still these will please all. Now what is the reason of this ? The remarkable reason of this is that anything that is beautiful by nature (rūḍhie) cannot be spoilt[71]."

The ladies stained their teeth red or black. People appear to have bored their ears, since it is a practice prescribed by the Hindu *śāstras*. We are told by Alberūnī that they did not cut any of the hair of the body. Originally they went naked in consequence of the heat, and by not cutting the hair of the head they intended to prevent sunstroke. They divided the moustache into single plaits in order to preserve it[72]. The military officers allowed beards to grow and even wore whiskers. Bāṇa's description of the Commander-in-Chief of Thāneśvara is worth quoting : "With tangled hair on the head, his cheeks covered with white bunches of whiskers and with his long white beard falling on his breast, as if fanning his master seated in the heart, though dead, with a camara"[73]. There is no reference even to the tonsure of widows. In the Pehoa praśasti of Mahendrapāla I of the Pratihāra dynasty, the widows of his enemies are spoken of as *shedding tears on* their cheeks and having long (not braided) and profuse

65. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
67. *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 75 and 96.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
71. *Karpūramañjarī* (ed. Manmohan Ghosh), p. 27.
72. Sachau, *AI*, I, pp. 179-80.
73. Bāṇa, *Harṣacarita*, Chap. VI.

tresses[74]. People appear to have used *shoes*, for Alberūnī informs us that they kept the shoes tight till they began to put them on. They were turned down from the calf before walking[75]. Perhaps most of the ladies went bare-foot.

Food

As regards food and drink of the people, the first thing that strikes us is that the Indians were little addicted to drink. We learn from the Arab traveller Sulaimān that the Indians "did not take wine, nor did they take vinegar which was made of wine. This did not arise from religious scruples, but from their disdain of it. They said, 'the prince who drank wine was no true king'.[76]" His observations may be further supplemented by the accounts of Al Mas'ūdi who says that "the Hindus abstained from drinking wine, and censured those who consumed it ; not because their religion forbade it, but in the dread of its clouding their reason and depriving them of its powers. If it could be proved of one of their kings, that he had drunk (wine), he forfeited the crown ; for he was (not considered to be) able to rule and govern (the empire) if his mind was affected".[77] We are told by Ibn Khurdādba that the kings and people of Hind regarded fornication as lawful and wine as unlawful.[78] Whatever may be said of the first part of the observation, the second is indeed creditable to the Indians. Ibn Khurdādba further tells us that the members of the Katariya class drank not more than three cups of wine.[79] It may safely be concluded that the Kṣatriyas were not the total abstainers like the Brāhmaṇas. Alberūnī,[80] however, informs us that the Indians of his time drank wine before having eaten anything and then they took their meal.

The Brāhmaṇas seem to have abstained from taking flesh, though not completely. There are conflicting accounts of the Muslim travellers. Al Mas'ūdi says that the Brāhmaṇas did not eat the flesh of any animal[81]. According to Alberūnī[82], the

74. EI, I, p. 246.
75. Sachau, AI, I p. 181.
76. Elliot, HI. I, p. 7.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
78. *Ibid.* p. 13.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
80. Sachau, AI, I, p. 180.
81. Elliot, HI, I, p. 19.
82. Sachau, AI, I, p. 204.

Brāhmaṇas had the privilege of eating the flesh of the gaṇḍa. He further informs us that the animals the killing of which was allowed were sheep, goats, gazelles, hares, rhinoceroses, the buffaloes, fish, water and land birds like sparrows, ring-doves, francolins, doves, peacocks and other animals which were not loathsome to man nor noxious. That which was forbidden were cows, horses, mules, asses, camels, elephants, tame poultry, crows, parrots, nightingales, all kinds of eggs and wine. The latter was allowed to the Śūdras[83]. The meat of these animals was forbidden in case they died a sudden death.[84] It was forbidden to the Brāhmaṇas, according to Alberūnī, to take five vegetables such as onions, garlic, a kind of gourd, the root of a plant like the carrots called krnen (?) and another vegetable which grew round their tanks called nāli[85]. Probably they did not take milk of any animal except the cow and she-buffalo. Every Brāhmaṇa appears to have had a water-vessel for himself while eating. If another one used it, it was broken.[86]

It appears that the usual food of the people consisted of grain, milk, sugar and clarified butter or ghee. From Alberūnī[87] we learn that the Hindus ate singly, one by one, on a table-cloth of dung. They did not make use of the remainder of a meal, and the plates from which they had eaten were thrown away if they were earthen. They had red teeth in consequence of chewing arecanuts with betel-leaves and chalk.

Manners and Customs

People of the period appear to have led a simple and healthy life. We are told in the *Karpūramañjarī*[88] that when persons met one another they saluted and hugged each other. Alberūnī[89] says that they did not ask permission to enter a house, but when they left it they asked permission to do so.

83. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 151-52.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
87. *Ibid.*, I, p. 180; II, p. 135.
88. Rājaśekhara, *Karpūramañjarī* (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 35.
89. Sachau, AI, I, p. 182.

It is hard to believe that a man entered the house of the other without raising a call and getting the response of some member of the house. Alberūnī's observation can hold good in case of ladies. Even to-day ladies make their way in a house without seeking permission. Alberūnī[90] further observes that in shaking hands they grasped the hand of a man from the convex side. In their meetings they set cross-legged. They considered the crepitus ventris as a good omen, sneezing a bad omen. The *Bālabhārata*[91] of Rājaśekhara tells us that when a man introduced himself to the other he took the name of his father. In washing they began with the feet, and then washed the face. On festive days they besmeared their bodies with dung instead of perfumes.[92]

We learn from Alberūnī[93] that it was the duty of a Brāhmaṇa, if he wanted to cohabit with his wife to get a child, to perform a sacrifice to the fire called *garbhādhāna*; but he did not perform it, because it required the presence of the woman, and therefore he felt ashamed to do so. In consequence he postponed the sacrifice and united it with the next following one, which was due in the fourth month of the pregnancy, called *sīmantonnayanam*. After the wife had given birth to a child, a third sacrifice was performed between the birth and the moment when the mother began to nourish the child. It was called *jātakarman*. The child received a name after the days of the childbed had elapsed. The sacrifice for the occasion of the name-giving was called *nāmakarman*. As long as the woman was in childbed, she did not touch any vessel, and nothing was eaten in her house, nor did the Brāhmaṇa light there a fire. These days were eight for the Brāhmaṇas, twelve for the Kṣatriyas, fifteen for the Vaiśyas and thirty for the Śūdras. For the low caste people who were not reckoned among any caste, no term was fixed. The sacrifice on the occasion of the first cutting of the child's hair was offered in the third, the perforation of the ear took place in the seventh and eighth years.

90. *Ibid.*
91. Rājaśekhara, *Bālabhārata* (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 4.
92. Sachau, AI, I, p. 181.
93. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 156-57.

Another custom was that the dead were usually burnt on pyre[94], except perhaps in the case of hermits whose dead bodies were buried. Alberūnī[95] says that those who could not afford to burn their dead, threw them either somewhere on the open field or into the running water. The Buddhists seem to have consigned the dead bodies to water[96]. The bodies of children under three years were not burnt[97]. Al Utbī[98] says that when the Hindus burnt their dead, they threw the ashes into the Gaṅgā, for they considered that the waters would purify them from sins. According to Alberūnī[99], they raised a monument similar to a milestone, plastered with gypsum, on the spot where the body was burnt. The body of the dead had a claim upon his heirs to wash, embalm, wrap it in a shroud, and then to burn it with as much sandal and other wood as they could get. Those who attended the funeral were all regarded as unclean and they all washed themselves as well as their dresses[100]. No one went to take food in a family afflicted with death. But after the funeral and the ceremonies connected with it were over, matters appear to have been again usual.

According to Alberūnī[101], the heirs of the deceased had to make, above the door of the house, something like a shelf projecting from the wall in the open air, on which they placed every day a dish of something cooked and a vessel of water, till the end of ten days after the death. On the tenth of the last mentioned days, the heir spent, in the name of the deceased, much food and cold water. After the eleventh day, the heir sent every day sufficient food for a single person and a dirham to the house of a Brāhmaṇa, and continued doing this during all the days of the mourning year without any interruption until its end. The duty of the heir towards the deceased in the first year consisted in his giving sixteen banquets,

---

94. Elliot, HI, I, p. 10; *Ibid.*, II, p. 45; Sachau, AI, II, p 169.
95. Sachau, AI, II, p. 170.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
98. Elliot, HI, II, pp. 45-46.
99. Sachau, AI, II, p. 169.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 165-66.

It is hard to believe that a man entered the house of the other without raising a call and getting the response of some member of the house. Alberūnī's observation can hold good in case of ladies. Even to-day ladies make their way in a house without seeking permission. Alberūnī[90] further observes that in shaking hands they grasped the hand of a man from the convex side. In their meetings they set cross-legged. They considered the crepitus ventris as a good omen, sneezing a bad omen. The *Bālabhārata*[91] of Rājaśekhara tells us that when a man introduced himself to the other he took the name of his father. In washing they began with the feet, and then washed the face. On festive days they besmeared their bodies with dung instead of perfumes.[92]

We learn from Alberūnī[93] that it was the duty of a Brāhmaṇa, if he wanted to cohabit with his wife to get a child, to perform a sacrifice to the fire called *garbhādhāna*; but he did not perform it, because it required the presence of the woman, and therefore he felt ashamed to do so. In consequence he postponed the sacrifice and united it with the next following one, which was due in the fourth month of the pregnancy, called *sīmantonnayanam*. After the wife had given birth to a child, a third sacrifice was performed between the birth and the moment when the mother began to nourish the child. It was called *jātakarman*. The child received a name after the days of the childbed had elapsed. The sacrifice for the occasion of the name-giving was called *nāmakarman*. As long as the woman was in childbed, she did not touch any vessel, and nothing was eaten in her house, nor did the Brāhmaṇa light there a fire. These days were eight for the Brāhmaṇas, twelve for the Kṣatriyas, fifteen for the Vaiśyas and thirty for the Śūdras. For the low caste people who were not reckoned among any caste, no term was fixed. The sacrifice on the occasion of the first cutting of the child's hair was offered in the third, the perforation of the ear took place in the seventh and eighth years.

---

90. *Ibid.*
91. Rājaśekhara, *Bālabhārata* (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 4.
92. Sachau, AI, I, p. 181.
93. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 156-57.

Another custom was that the dead were usually burnt on pyre[94], except perhaps in the case of hermits whose dead bodies were buried. Alberūnī[95] says that those who could not afford to burn their dead, threw them either somewhere on the open field or into the running water. The Buddhists seem to have consigned the dead bodies to water[96]. The bodies of children under three years were not burnt[97]. Al Utbī[98] says that when the Hindus burnt their dead, they threw the ashes into the Gaṅgā, for they considered that the waters would purify them from sins. According to Alberūnī[99], they raised a monument similar to a milestone; plastered with gypsum, on the spot where the body was burnt. The body of the dead had a claim upon his heirs to wash, embalm, wrap it in a shroud, and then to burn it with as much sandal and other wood as they could get. Those who attended the funeral were all regarded as unclean and they all washed themselves as well as their dresses[100]. No one went to take food in a family afflicted with death. But after the funeral and the ceremonies connected with it were over, matters appear to have been again usual.

According to Alberūnī[101], the heirs of the deceased had to make, above the door of the house, something like a shelf projecting from the wall in the open air, on which they placed every day a dish of something cooked and a vessel of water, till the end of ten days after the death. On the tenth of the last mentioned days, the heir spent, in the name of the deceased, much food and cold water. After the eleventh day, the heir sent every day sufficient food for a single person and a dirham to the house of a Brāhmaṇa, and continued doing this during all the days of the mourning year without any interruption until its end. The duty of the heir towards the deceased in the first year consisted in his giving sixteen banquets,

---

94. Elliot, III, I, p. 10 ; *Ibid.*, II, p. 45 ; Sachau, AI, II, p. 169.
95. Sachau, AI, II, p. 170.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
98. Elliot, III, II, pp. 45-46.
99. Sachau, AI, II, p. 169.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 165-66.

where every guest in addition to his food received alms also, *viz.*, on the fifteenth and sixteenth days after death; further, once a month during the whole year. The banquet in the sixth month was to be more rich and more liberal than the others. Further, the banquet on the last but one day of the year was devoted to the deceased and his ancestors and the final banquet was on the last day of the year. If the heir was a son, he had to wear mourning dress throughout the year. Nourishment was forbidden to the heirs for one single day in the first part of the mourning year.

We learn from Abū Zaid[102] that some of the kings of India when they ascended the throne, they got a quantity of rice cooked and served on banana leaves. Attached to the king's person were three or four hundred companions, who joined him of their own free will without compulsion. When the king had eaten the rice, he gave it to his companions. Each in his turn approached, took a small quantity and ate it. All those who so ate the rice were obliged, when the king died, or was slain, to burn themselves to the very last man on the very day of the king's decease. This was a duty which admitted of no delay and not a vestige of these men was to be left. This account of Abū Zaid is nothing short of a traveller's tale. A reference to this effect is not found in the accounts of the other Arab travellers and the indigenous sources. Abū Zaid never visited India and his accounts are based on hearsay.

He further informs us that when a person became old and the senses were enfeebled, he begged some one of his family to throw him in the water[103]. According to Alberūnī[104], no man of distinction did it except the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras, specially at those times which were prized as the most suitable for a man to acquire in them, for a future repetition of life, a better form and condition than that in which he happened to have been born and to live. Burning oneself was forbidden to Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas by a special law. Therefore, if they wanted to kill themselves, they did so at the time of an eclipse in some other manner, or they hired somebody to drown them in the Gaṅgā, keeping them under water till they were dead.

102. Elliot, III, I, p. 9.
103. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.
104. Sachau, AI, II, p. 170.

CHAPTER VIII

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

The Vedas were the basis of religion. Long before the dawn of the early mediaeval period, the Hindu concept of religion was crystallised. The Rgveda laid the emphasis on rituals and so was the case during the days of the later Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas. The Rgvedic gods were terrestrial (pṛthvisthāna), aerial or intermediate (antarikṣasthāna or madhyamasthāna) and celestial (dyusthāna). The gods were manifestations of nature. There was no image worship. The lap of nature was soothing, comfortable and showering prosperity so long it was favourably disposed towards mankind. The people stretched their hands to the rain-god (Indra) for the prosperity of their fields. Oblations were made to the fire (Agni) to invoke the blessings of the gods. The concept in general was that gods could be approached through the fire. This gave a fillip to rituals. Accuracy in performing the rituals and chanting the Vedic hymns was emphasised. The presiding Brāhmaṇa was counted upon as an important figure on such occasions. He was assisted by other Brāhmaṇas such as the Hotṛi (Invoker), the Udgātṛi (Chanter) and the Adhvaryu (Performer). The sacrificer (*yajamāna*) had to pay liberal fees to the Brāhmaṇas. If the sacrificer incurred the displeasure of the Brāhmaṇas, the latter could mince words and thus defeat the purpose of the sacrifice. The *Śrauta* and *Smārta* sacrifices were common in the period of the Vedas. In the last days of the later Vedic period, there had set in a quest for something higher and deeper than rituals. This urge found its way in the *Āraṇyakas*. The *Āraṇyakas* are the concluding portions of the *Brāhmaṇas* and can rightly be described as a bridge between the *karma-mārga* (way of works) of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *jñāna-mārga* (way of knowledge) of the *Upaniṣads*. The *Upaniṣads* represent the deep thinking of the seers on *Brahman* (Universal soul) and jiva *Ātmā* (individual soul). Though the *Upaniṣads* are not unanimous with regard to the concept of Universal Soul and the Individual Soul, they pre-

sent a strong case to believe that the Universal Soul and the Individual Soul are one and the same. The concepts of '*tat tvam asi*' (Thou art That) and '*ātmānaṁ viddhiḥ*' (know thyself) are the very kernel of the *Upaniṣadic* philosophy. 'The theological-philosophical systems of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and others are founded on the *Vedānta-Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa which in their turn are reared on the doctrines of the *Upaniṣads*'.

New Trends in Hinduism

During the reign of the illustrious Harṣa of Kānyakubja Buddhism and Hinduism flourished side by side. It was after his death that the former began to decline. The cult of devotion and the *Paurāṇic* Hinduism seem to have developed. Incarnations of Viṣṇu such as *Matsya* (fish), *Kūrma* (tortoise), *Varāha* (boar), *Narasiṁha* (man-lion), *Vāmana* (dwarf), *Paraśurāma, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Buddha* and *Kalkin*[1] appear to have become popular gods. Images of Viṣṇu were enshrined in temples. The Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin temple stone inscription[2], dated V.S. 932=875 A.D., bears testimony to the fact that Alla built a temple of Viṣṇu for the development of spiritual merit. The Siyadoni epigraph refers to a number of synonymous names of Viṣṇu such as Viṣṇubhaṭṭāraka, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka, Vāmanasvāmideva (also referred to in the Ahar inscription[3]), Cakrasvāmideva, Tribhuvanasvāmideva and Murāri[4]. In the Gwalior inscription of Bhoja I of Kānyakubja, he is called Narakadviṣa[5]. The Buckala inscription, dated V.S. 872=815 A.D., calls him Parameśvara[6]. Some scholars believe that Parameśvara is used for Śiva. "This, however, does not agree with the sculptural details of the temple. Although it is nowadays called a temple of Pārvatī, there is, truly speaking, no image in the sanctum. But on the dedicatory block on the shrine door and in the principal niche at the back, the images which enable one to determine to what god

1. EI, XIX, p. 60.
2. *Ibid.*, I, p. 157.
3. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 57.
4. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 168, 173-79.
5. *Ibid.*, XVIII, pp. 107, 110, vv. 1, 25.
6. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 200.

the temple is dedicated, is a figure with four hands, doubtless representing some form of Viṣṇu, as the mace, discus and conchshell can be distinctly seen in its hands. Other images, also carved on the inner and outer walls of the temple, show that it was a Vaiṣṇava structure". The Pehoa record simply describes Viṣṇu as the god riding on garuḍa (*Viṣṇu garuḍāsana*[7]).

The next popular god very frequently referred to in the epigraphs of the period is Śiva. We come across his several names such as Umāmaheśvara[8], Trilocana[9], Lacchukeśvara Mahādeva[10], Yogasvāmin[11], Paśupati[12], Śambhu[13], Siddheśvara Mahādeva[14], Mahākāla[15], Kālapriya[16] and Aghoreśvara in the inscriptions. The Jodhpur inscription of Bāuka tells us that *Śiluka constructed a lofty temple (mandir) of Siddheśvara* Mahādeva at the holy place called Tretā[17]. Śiva appears to have been worshipped in human as well as phallic form[18]. Śiva-lingas were installed in temples. The Cālukya king Mūlarāja was a fervent devotee of Śiva in the form of Somanātha or Someśvara and the temple of Mūleśvara and the Tripuruṣaprāsāda appear to have been built by him in honour of Somanātha[19]. Ekalinga Śiva was worshipped in Mewar[20]. Ujjayini or Avanti was famous through the ages for the worship of Śiva. It has been the seat of worship of Mahākāla Śiva. In c. 916-17 A.D. the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III on his way to conquer Kānyakubja stayed in the courtyard of Mahākāla to pay his homage to the deity. A Paramāra chief

---

7. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 187, 189.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
9. IA, XVIII, pp. 11, 13.
10. EI, III, pp. 263-67.
11. IA, XVI, p. 175.
12. EI, VII, p. 95.
13. IA, XII p. 195.
14. EI, XVIII, p. 96.
15. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 185-86.
16. *Ibid.*. VII, p. 38
17. *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 98
18. Sachau, AI, II, p. 103.
19. Merutunga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi (Singhi ed.)*, p. 17.
20. JBBRAS, 1903-08, XXII, pp. 166-67

of Vāgaḍa (former states of Banswara and Dungarpur in southern Rajputana) named Dhanika[21] is known to have built the Śiva temple of Dhaneśvara near Mahākāla about the middle of the tenth century A.D. Another celebrated seat of Śaivism in North India in the tenth and eleventh centuries was Bundelkhand (modern southern districts of Uttar Pradesh and some areas of Madhya Pradesh bordering on the southern boundary of U.P.). The splendour of Khajuraho reached its peak in the tenth century A D. during the reign of the Candella king Dhaṅga, who was a devout Śaiva, and died, according to the Khajuraho stone inscription, dated V.S. 1059=1002 A.D., at Prayāga, "fixing the thoughts on Rudra and muttering holy prayers."[22] From the same inscription we learn that he erected a magnificent temple for the god Śambhu. "He also distributed great quantities of gold and established in connection with the temple dwellings for pious Brāhmaṇas to whom donations were made of land, grain, money and cows."[23] The largest building of the Khajuraho group of temples is the Śiva temple called Kandariyā Mahādeva, believed to have been erected during the tenth century A.D.

The inscriptions further refer to Sūrya among gods worshipped during the period under review. He was known by various names such as Indrarājādityadeva, Indrādityadeva[24], Taruṇādityadeva[25] and Gaṅgāditya[26]. The Siyadoni inscription refers to a term Bhaillasvāmideva, which 'according to a Bhilsa record was a designation of the sun.'[27] Lolārka[28] seems to have been another form of the sun. There is a tank, almost dried up, at Vārāṇasī on the way to Assī from Durgākuṇḍa called Lolārka-kuṇḍa. Even now on the occasion of the solar eclipse Hindus take a dip in that kuṇḍa before proceeding to have a dip in the Gaṅgā. The Partabgarh inscription of Pratihāra Mahendrapāla

21. EI, XXI, p. 41.
22. *Ibid.*, I, p. 146.
23. *Ibid.*, vv. 52-54.
24. *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 180-85.
25. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 1, 5.
26. *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 121-23.
27. JASB, XXXI, p. 112.
28. EI, V, pp. 116-18 ; *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 128-29.

It informs us that the Cāhamāna prince Indrarāja built a temple to the sun-god (Indrādityadeva) and applied to the Governor of Ujjain for an endowment for its upkeep[29].

The inscriptions also refer to such gods as Vināyaka[30] or Dāmodara, Kumāra[31] (Kārtikeya) with his host of Mātrikas (female companions), Indramādhava and Lauḍeśvara.

The worship of goddesses such as Bhagavatī[32], also called Durgā, Caṇḍikā[33] or Cāmuṇḍā[34], Śrī Amba Lohīdevī[35], Śrī or Lakṣmī[36], Vaṭayakṣṇidevī[37], Kanakadevī or Kāñcanadevī[38], Sarvamaṅgaladevī[39], Vasudhārā[40], Gandhadevī, Gaurī[41] and Vāṅgmūrti[42] (goddess of speech), seems to have been current. Bāṇa in his Kādambarī refers to offerings of blood made to Caṇḍikā and her slaughter of Mahisāsura.

Chiselling of Idols : Alberūnī's Account

Idols of these gods and goddesses appear to have been chiselled with due attention. Alberūnī tells us that "all idols are constructed according to certain measures determined by idol-fingers for every single limb, but sometimes they differ regarding the measure of a limb. If the artist keeps the right measure and does not make anything too large nor too small, he is free from sin, and is sure that the being which he represented will not visit him with any mishap. If he makes the idol one cubit high and together with the throne two cubits, he will obtain health. If he makes it higher still, he will be praised. But he must know that making the idol too large, specially that of the sun,

29. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 186.
30. *Ibid.*, IX, p. 279.
31. *Ibid.*, XVIII, pp. 109, 114, v. 22.
32. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 183 ; IA, XV, p. 140 ; *Ibid.*, p. 112.
33. Bāṇa, Kādambarī, para 28.
34. Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjarī (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 100.
35. EI, I, p. 178, line 35.
36. *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 109, v. 18.
37. *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 183, line 33.
38. *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 59.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
40. *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 325, 327, v. 21.
41. Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjarī (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 99.
42. Rājaśekhara, Bālabhārata (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.), p. 1.

will hurt the ruler, and making it too small will hurt the artist. If he gives it a thin belly, this helps and furthers the famine in the country ; if he gives it a lean belly, this ruins property. If the hand of the artist slips so as to produce something like a wound, he will have a wound in his own body which will kill him. If it is not completely even on both sides, so that the one shoulder is higher than the other, his wife will perish. If he turns the eye upward, he will be blind for lifetime ; if he turns it downward, he will have many troubles and sorrows.[43]"

Alberūnī further says that if a statue is made of some precious stone, it is better than if it were made of wood, and wood is better than clay. The benefits of a statue of precious stone will be common to all the men and women of the empire. A golden statue will bring power to him who erected it, a statue of silver will bring him renown, one of bronze will bring him an increase of his rule, one of stone the acquisition of landed property.[44]

Pujārīs (Worshippers)

As regards the pujārīs (worshippers) of the gods and goddesses, Alberūnī makes the following observation : "To the idol of Viṣṇu are devoted the class called Bhāgavata ; to the idol of the sun, the Maga, *i.e.*, the Magians ; to the idol of Mahādeva, a class of saints, anchorites with long hair, who cover their skin with ashes, hang on their persons the bones of dead people, and swim in the pools. The Brāhmaṇas are devoted to the Eight Mothers, the Shamanians to Buddha, to Arhant the class called Nagna."[45] The Jainas worshipped their Tīrthaṅkaras. The Deogadh pillar inscription of Bhoja I, dated V.S. 919=862 A.D., refers to a temple of the holy (Jaina Arhat) Śānti (or Śāntinātha) at Luacchagira.[46]

The eclectic tendencies of the times appear to have engen-

---

43. Sachau, AI, I, pp. 120-21.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
46. EI, IV, p. 309.

dered a great spirit of toleration. Followers of different sects[47] met each other without sectarian jealousy. We are told by Bāṇa that in the āśrama of *Divākaramitra* were assembled Ārhatas (Jainas), Maskaris (Sanyāsis), Śvetapatas (Śvetāmbara Jainas), white clothed Bhikṣus, Bhāgavatas, Varṇis (Brahmacāris), Keśaluñcakas (those who rooted out their hair), Kāpilas, Lokāyatikas (atheists), Janis (Buddhists), Kāṇādas (followers of Kanāda's Vaiśeṣika philosophy), Aupaniṣadas (Vedāntins), Aiśvarakaranikas (Naiyāyikas) and Karandhamas (the philosophers of Dhātuvāda or elements). The widened outlook in religion is remarkably reflected in the religious ideals of the *Pratihāras* of Kānyakubja. The Pratihāra *kings did* not confine their spiritual allegiance to one and the same deity. Vatsarāja[48] and Mahendrapāla[49] II are described in inscriptions as devotees of Śiva, whereas Nāgabhaṭa II, Mihira *Bhoja and Mahendrapāla I are said to have been avowed* worshippers of Bhagavatī[50]. Mihira Bhoja was also devoted to a special manifestation of Viṣṇu[51]. Rāmabhadra and Mahīpāla are characterised as 'paramādityabhakta[52]'—devout worshippers of the sun-god. The *latter seems to have had* predilections for the worship of Bhagavatī as well, for her image occurs on his seal.

The different modes of worship of the gods and goddesses gave rise to new codes called Āgamas and Tantras which laid down provisions for such worship and asceticism.

Religious Practices : Sacrifices

The Vedic householder, sacrificing morning and evening to the household fire[53], seems to have been still alive though his number was declining. Atrisaṁhitā[54] says that a Brāhmaṇa,

---

47. *Ibn* Khurdādba tells us that there were forty-two religious sects in Hind. Elliot, *III, I*, p. 17. See also the account of *Al Idrisi*, *Ibid.*, p. 76.

48. IA, XV, p. 112.

49. EI, XIV, p. 183.

50. *Ibid.*, IA, XV, pp. 112, 140.

51. EI, I, p. 156.

52. IA, XV, pp. 112, 140.

53. Sachau, AI, II, p. 131.

54. V. 224.

who does not keep *agnihotra*, is a person whose food should not be accepted. The existence of *agnihotra* is borne out by Alberūnī who observes that the Brāhmaṇas who kept one fire were called Ishṭins and those who kept three were called Agnihotrins.[55] 'Agnihotra, however, was too troublesome to be long practised and the worship of idols which gradually was now introduced into every house left the other worship neglected'.

The Gṛhya-sūtra ritual requires animal sacrifices in connection with some popular deities[56]. These sacrifices appear to have prevailed during the early mediaeval period of Indian history, for we are told by Alberūnī that the worshippers of some deities like Durgā, Mahādeva, Kṣetrapāla, etc., killed sheep and buffaloes with axes to offer them as *naivedya* to their gods and goddesses[57].

Daily Ablutions and *Sandhyās*

Another feature of Hinduism of this period seems to have been the performance of daily ablutions and Sandhyās[58]. Alberūnī says that a Brāhmaṇa had to wash himself thrice a day[59]. Atri lays down that a twice-born should recite *sandhyā* thrice a day[60]. Vyāsa concurs and names the three *sandhyās* as Gāyatrī, Sarasvatī and Sāvitrī[61].

Fasts

Fasts also appear to have gained popularity.[62] Alberūnī dwells upon their various forms and records them as follows: upavāsa, kṛcchra, parāka, candrāyaṇa and māsavāsa (māsopavāsa).[63] He further records the efficacy of fasts. "If a man fasts all the days of Caitra, he obtains wealth

55. Sachau, AI, I, p. 102.
56. Mānava, II, 14; Āpastamba, XX, 12-20; Bharadvāja, II, 10.
57. Sachau, AI, I, p. 120.
58. Rājaśekhara, Bālabhārata (ed. Pt. D.P. and K.P.P.).
59. Sachau, AI, II, p. 133.
60. Quoted in Ācāramayūkha, p. 39.
61. *Ibid.*
62. EI, XVIII, p. 96, vv. 22-23; JRAS, 1895, p. 516, v. 5.
63. Sachau, AI, II, pp. 172-73.

and joy over the nobility of his children. If he fasts Vaiśākha, he will be a lord over his tribe and great in his army. If he fasts Jaiṣṭha, he will be a favourite of the women. If he fasts Āṣāḍha, he will obtain wealth. If he fasts Śrāvaṇa, he obtains wisdom. If he fasts Bhādrapada, he obtains health and valour, riches and cattle. If he fasts Āśvayuja, he will always be victorious over his enemies. If he fasts Kārttika, he will be grand in the eyes of people and will obtain his wishes. If he fasts Mārgaśīrsha, he will be born in the most beautiful and fertile country. If he fasts Pausha, he obtains a high reputation. If he fasts Māgha, he obtains innumerable wealth. If he fasts Phālguṇa, he will be beloved. He, however, who fasts during all the months of the year, only twelve times breaking the fast, will reside in paradise 10,000 years, and will thence return to life as the member of a noble, high and respected family[64]".

Fasts were observed on some auspicious days. We are told by Alberūnī that "the eighth and eleventh days of the white half of every month are fast days, except in the case of the leap month, for it is disregarded, being considered unlucky. When the moon is in Rohiṇī, the fourth of her stations, on the eighth day of the black half, it is a fast-day called Jayanti. Giving alms on this day is an expiation for all sins. This condition of the fast-day does not in general apply to all months. but in particular only to Bhādrapada, since Vāsudeva was born in this month and on this day, whilst the moon stood in the station Rohiṇī. When the moon stands in Punarvasu, the seventh of her stations, on the eleventh day of the white half of the month, this is a fast-day, called Atj (? Aṭṭāṭaja). If a man does works of piety on this day, he will be enabled to obtain whatever he wishes. The sixth day of Caitra is a fast day holy to the sun. In the month of Āshāḍha, when the moon stands in Anurādhā, the seventeenth of her signs, there is a fast day holy to Vāsudeva called Devasini (?). The day of full moon in the month Śrāvaṇa is a fast day holy to Somanātha. When in the month Āśvayuja the moon stands in Alsharaṭān (the

64. *Ibid*, pp. 173-74.

lunar station) and the sun is in virgo, it is a fast day. The eighth of the same month is a fast day holy to Bhagavatī. Fasting is broken when the moon rises. The fifth day of Bhādrapada is a fast day holy to the sun, called Shaṭ. They anoint the solar rays, and in particular those rays which enter through the windows, with various kinds of balsamic ointments, and place upon them odoriferous plants and flowers. When in the month of Kārttika the moon stands in Revatī, the last of her stations, it is a fast day in commemoration of the waking up of Vāsudeva. It is called deotthinī, *i.e.*, the rising of the Deva. On that day they soil themselves with the dung of cows, and break fasting by feeding upon a mixture of cow's milk, wine and dung. This day is the first of the five days which are called Bhīṣma pañcarātri. They fast during them in honour of Vāsudeva. On the second of them the Brahmans break fasting, after them the others. On the sixth day of Pauṣa is a fasting in honour of the sun. On the third day of Māgha there is a fasting for the women, not for the men. It is called Gaur-t-r (gaurītṛitiyā?) and lasts the whole day and night.[65]"

Dāna (Gifts)

Stress was also laid on dāna (gifts). The records depose that villages or lands were granted to temples and Brāhmaṇas free of rent and forced labour. Al Utbī informs us that "*the kings of Hind, the chiefs of that country, and rich devotees, used to amass their treasures and precious jewels, and send them time after time to be presented to the large idol that they might receive a reward for their good deeds and draw near to their God.*[66]" It was customary for donors to make grants by a libation of water after bathing in a sacred river such as the Gaṅgā[67], the Yamunā[68], or in confluence of rivers such as the Sarayū and the Ghargharā,[69] the Triveṇī at Allahabad[70] or that of the Varuṇā and the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī[71].

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 175-77.
66. Elliot, HI. II, p. 34.
67. JASB, 1922, V, p. 83.
68. IA, XIV, p. 103.
69. EI, XIV, pp. 194, 196.
70. *Ibid.*, XIII, p. 129.
71 *Ibid.*, XIV, pp. 198, 199.

The usual occasions for such gifts were the lunar[72] or solar[73] eclipse, the annual śrāddha in honour of one's father[74], the royal birthday (jātakarma[75]), the name giving (nāmakaraṇa[76]) or the installation[77] ceremonies, the Uttarāyaṇa[78] and the Dakṣiṇāyana[79] Saṁkrāntis, the Akṣayatṛtiyā[80] festival and so on.

Among the objects gifted the most prominent seem to have been villages, lands, cows, gold, clothes, horses and bedstead. The Bengal Asiatic Society's plate of Mahārāja Vināyakapāla records that a village named Tikkarigrāma in the Vārāṇasī-viṣaya of the Pratiṣṭhāna-bhukti, was given by Vināyakapāla, in order to increase the religious merit of his parents, after bathing on the sixth lunar day in the river Gangā to Bhaṭṭa Bhullāka of the Darbhi *gotra*[81]. The Partabgarh stone inscription, dated V.S. 1003=946 A.D., refers to a gift given by Mādhava. It tells us that Mādhava having come to Ujjayinī on business, bathed at the temple of Mahākāla, worshipped the god Śiva and meditated on the unreality of life and wealth, bestowed, on the Mina Saṁkrānti day, the village of Dhārāpadraka, with all its appurtenances, for repairs to, and maintenance of daily services at the temple of Indrādityadeva at Ghonṭavarshikā, a place associated with Nityapramuditadeva, at the request of the great feudatory Indrarāja, son of Durlabharāja of the Cāhamāna race[82]. The Jhusi copper-plate inscription, dated V.S. 1084=1027 A.D., states that Trilocanapāla after having bathed in the Gaṅgā and having worshipped Śiva, etc., gave Labhundaka village with its belongings to six thousand Brāhmaṇas belonging to

72. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 101.
73. *Ibid*, p 108.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
76. IA, XIII, pp. 131, 134.
77. EI, IV, p. 121.
78. *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 159
79. IA, XVIII, p. 35.
80. EI, VII, pp. 98-99.
81. IA, XV, pp. 140-41
82. EI, XIV, pp. 185-86.

Pratiṣṭhāna on the occasion of the Dakṣiṇāyana Saṁkrānti[83]. The Pehoa inscription refers to a tax imposed by horse-dealers on the sale of horses for the benefit of three temples built in Kanauj and a fourth built at Pehoa or Pṛthūdaka on the river Sarasvatī in the Punjab, to be divided in certain fixed proportions among them[84].

Perhaps gifts were also made with a view to propitiating the planets. The images of the planets were probably made of copper, crystal, red sandal-wood, gold, silver, iron, lead and bell-metal or they might have been drawn on a piece of cloth in these colours or painted in circles on the ground with colours. It is very likely that flowers, clothes, fragrant substances and incense of guggulū were offered to them and oblations of cooked food were made to them in fire.

Pilgrimage

The cult of pilgrimage appears to have become fairly popular in the period under consideration. Certain places such as Vārāṇasī (Banaras), Pūkara (Puṣkara), Kurukṣetra, Mathurā and Multān were centres of pilgrimage[85]. We are told by Alberūnī that pilgrimages were not obligatory to the Hindus, but facultative and meritorious[86]. He further adds, "A man sets off to wander to some holy region, to some much venerated idol or to some of the holy rivers. He worships in them, worships the idol, makes presents to it, recites many hymns and prayers, fasts and gives alms to the Brahmans, the priests, and others. He shaves the hair of his head and beard, and returns home.[87]" That observations of Alberūnī are correct to the core is borne out by the fact that even to this day when a pilgrim moves out to visit a holy place, he takes recourse to the practices referred to by Alberūnī. He takes a dip in the river, if the place of pilgrimage happens to be on the bank of a river, worships the idol associated with the place, observes fast and gives alms.

---

83. IA, XVIII, p. 34.
84. EI, I, pp. 242-50.
85. Sachau, AI, II, pp. 146-49.
86. Ibid., p. 142.
87. Ibid.

Religious Beliefs : Belief in Metempsychosis and Karma

Belief in the transmigration of soul and the role of karma in determining the successive births were intertwined in the life of the Hindus. The doctrine of the transmigration of soul though not clearly formulated in the Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, the very concept of these scriptures that agony of death is to be endured not once but in repeated deaths, leaves no room to doubt that the doctrine of the transmigration of soul had its genesis in the earlier scriptures of the Hindus. The Ṛgveda makes suggestions to the ideas of karma and transmigration which work as positive proofs for the existence of the belief in the earliest scripture of the Hindus. The doctrine of the transmigration of soul was developed in the Bṛhidāraṇyaka Upaniṣad and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad gives the most detailed account of the theory of transmigration.

The Arab travellers of the period under review were struck with the firm belief of the Hindus in metempsychosis[88]. The creed is peculiar to the Hindus and it has remained unshaken throughout all the changes in philosophical thought. That the soul is immortal and that it migrates from body to body, even a vegetable body, has been believed in by the Buddhists, the jainas and the Hindus. Both the orthodox and the unorthodox, the Hindus and the Buddhists have utilized their belief in metempsychosis to inculcate high principles of morality on their communities. There was a strong belief that the punishment for sin and the reward for merits were sure to overtake the soul in the next life if not in this and this fear, it cannot but be said to the credit of it, made the Hindu society moral.

Ahimsā and Sanyasa

The theories of Ahiṁsā and Sanyāsa seem to have gained popularity. The former appears to have become acceptable to almost all the different schools of religious thought in India. Its opponents were mainly the Mimāṁsakas or the upholders

88. Elliot, HI, I, pp. 7, 9.

of the old Vedic sacrifices, besides, of course, the Lokāyatikas or atheists and perhaps Pāśupatas but even these Mīmāṁsakas had already come round to accept it so far as ordinary slaughter of animals was concerned. The cause of *sanyāsa* was championed by Śaṅkarācārya. He advocated the superiority of *sanyāsa* to *karmamārga*. The rage for *pravrajyā* or giving up the world seems to have been due to the belief that this world was full of misery, that the soul was bound in the chain of transmigration from body to body according to its *karma* and that the only escape from the misery of the present and future births lay in *pravrajyā*.

Philosophy : Schools of Thought

The period is richly cultivated by the theological discussions of different schools of thought. The Hindu philosophy was marked by the vibrations of the different schools of thought which were noted for their interpretations of many a philosophical concept of the Hindus. The school of Śaṅkara, the Vaiśeṣikas, the Pāśupatas, the Kulācāryas, the Sāṁkhyas, and the Bārhaspatyas were among the most important schools of thought known to the period under consideration. A conflict between Jainism and Śaivism was quite pronounced. Somadeva, a Jaina monk, who wrote his Yaśastilaka in Ś. S. 881 = 959 A.D. under the patronage of Vāgarāja, the Cālukya ruler of Lemulavāḍa, refers to the schools of thought prevalent in his time.

Śaṅkara School of Thought

The Vedānta-school prominent in Somadeva's time was the Advaita-school of Śaṅkarācārya. Śaṅkara's critics were vocal to allege that he had initiated the doctrine of the Buddha, nay, he was a Buddist in disguise. Śaṅkara did not claim to be the exponent of an original system. He agreed with the Mīmāṁsakas that the Vedas were mandatory in nature but sought to prove that the Upaniṣads are the repository of the highest and the truest knowledge of the Absolute. The learned can achieve salvation through the knowledge of the Upaniṣads. He interpreted the Sūtras and the Upaniṣads to establish that there existed a connected and systematic philosophy in the Upaniṣads which was enunciated in the Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa.

Śaṅkara through his advaita (non-dualistic) Vedānta philosophy taught that the ultimate and absolute truth is *self*, which is one, though appearing as many in different individuals. "The world also as apart from us the individuals has no reality and has no other truth to show than this *self*. All other events, mental or physical, are but passing appearances, while the only absolute and unchangeable truth underlying them all is the *self*.[89]"

The Vaisesikas

Somadeva refers to two classes of Vaiśeṣika thinkers: the Tārkika Vaiśeṣikas and the Saiddhānta Vaiśeṣikas. The Tārkika Vaiśeṣikas laid stress on knowledge. The Saiddhānta Vaiśeṣikas were the worshippers of Śiva and laid emphasis on faith. The Vaiśeṣika system takes its name from viśeṣa or particularity. It is in the particulars of the world, pre-eminently in the particular imperceptible souls and atoms, according to Vaiśeṣika system, that true individuality exists. "The Vaiśeṣika is essentially a philosophy of distinctions, since it does not tolerate any attempt to dissipating the independence of selves and objects in a supposed more perfect individuality.........The Vaiśeṣika is not interested in constructing an all-embracing synthesis within whose bounds there is room for all that is, bringing all the variety of the worlds of sense and of thought under a single comprehensive formula.[90]" According to Garbe, "the Vaiśeṣika system seems to be of much greater antiquity than the Nyāya.[91]"

The Tārkika Vaiśeṣikas who were the followers of the Vaiśeṣika system proper held that salvation results from the perception of the categories which they described as Substance, Quality, Action, Generality, Particularity, Inherence and Non-existence[92], based on the understanding of their similarities and dissimilarities. Unlike them the Saiddhānta Vaiśeṣikas believed that faith in his corporeal Śiva, in and incorporeal aspects, leads to salvation[93].

89. Dasgupta, HIP, I, p. 439.
90. Radhakrishnan, IP, II, p. 176.
91. Garbe, PAI, p. 20.
92. Somadeva, Yaśastilaka, II, p. 269.
93. *Ibid.*

The Pāśupatas

The Pāśupata system was of ancient origin. The Mahābhārata makes mention of the Pāśupata theology. The Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha and Advaitānanda's Brahmavidyābharaṇa refer to the Pāśupata system. Śaṅkarācārya[94] in his Bhāṣya on the Vedānta Sūtras criticises the theology of the Pāśupatas. In the ninth century A.D. the Pāśupatas were one of the four Śaiva sects as referred to by Vācaspati in his Bhāmatī and Bhāskara in the Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya.

The Pāśupatas believed that rituals alone could lead to salvation. According to them, salvation is not only cessation of pain but acquisition of unlimited supernatural powers. The Pāśupatas had their own elaborate practices which constituted their rituals. Somadeva refers to their chief practices. According to him, the chief Pāśupata practices were the smearing of the body with ashes in the morning, at noon and in the evening, adoration of the phallus of Śiva, offering of water-pots, circumambulation from left to right and self-humiliation[95].

The Kulācāryas

The Kulācāryas held that salvation was the outcome of unstinted indulgence in all kinds of food and drink, forbidden or otherwise. Yaśaḥpāla, a Jaina writer of the twelfth century A.D., in his drama Moharājaparājaya refers to the identical views of the Kulācāryas or Kaulas. The Kaula exhorts in the play that one should give the reins to one's desires and take meat and drink heavily. Somadeva identifies the views of the Kulācāryas with those of Trikamata. After taking meat and drink, according to the Trikamata system, one should worship Śiva with wine in the company of a female partner sitting on one's left[96].

The Sāṁkhyas

The Yaśastilaka refers to two statements of the Sāṁkhyas defining salvation. The first holds that salvation results from

94. SB, ii. 2. 37-39.
95. Somadeva, Yaśastilaka, II, p. 269.
96. *Ibid.*

discrimination between Matter (Prakṛti) and the Self (Puruṣa[97]). The second considers the salvation a condition in which 'the Self subsides in the pristine state (of pure consciousness) after the cessation of intellect, mind and egoism, resulting in the destruction of the sense organs[98].'

The Sāṁkhya 'system takes its name from the fact that it arrives at its conclusions by means of theoretical investigation'. Some believe that the word 'Sāṁkhya' is derived from saṁkhyā or number[99]. "In the early texts, 'Sāṁkhya' is used in the sense of philosophical reflection and not numerical reckoning. The particular system, which expounds by careful reflection the nature of puruṣa or spirit, and the other entities, acquired its significant title.[100]"

We first find a mention of the Sāṁkhya in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad[101], though the earlier Upaniṣads dwell upon the elements co-ordinated into the system. The Mahābhārata reflects a definite movement of thought bearing identity with the Sāṁkhya. The Sāṁkhya influence on Manu is apparent by his reference to the three sources of knowledge[102], the detailed account of the three guṇas[103] and the description of the creation. The Purāṇas—the Bhāgavata[104], the Matsya[105], the Agni[106], and the Mārkaṇḍeya[107]—and the later Vedānta works have used the Sāṁkhya theories exclusive of the Sāṁkhya's atheistic metaphysics. The extant Sāṁkhya works are later in origin than Buddhism. But the system precedes Buddhism[108]. The casual coincidences in thought, viz., 'insistence on suffering, the subordination of the Vedic sacrifices and denunciation of ascetic extravagances, indifference to theism and the belief in

97. *Ibid.*
98. *Ibid.*, p. 270.
99. Garbe, *PAI*, p. 44.
100. Radhakrishnan, *IP*, *II*, p. 249.
101. vi. 13.
102. xii. 105.
103. xii. 24-25.
104. *iii. 5.*
105. iii.
106. xvii.
107. xiv.
108. MB, xii. 13711 ; Radhakrishnan, IP, II, p. 251.

the constant becoming of the world (pariṇāminityatva)', between the Sāṁkhya and Buddhism, do not justify the theory that Buddhism was the source of the Sāṁkhya system and that they borrowed from each other. "Buddhism does not accept any of the central principles of the Sāṁkhya, an inactive puruṣa, an ultimate prakṛti and theory of the guṇas. If the Buddhist chain of causation resembles, in some respects, the Sāṁkhya theory of evolution, it is because both of them have for their common source the Upaniṣads.[109]"

The Bārhaspatyas

Somadeva refers to the Bārhaspatyas or the Lokāyatikas, the materialists popularly known as the Cārvākas. He calls them the leaders of all the *nāstikas* or materialists. The Cārvākas denied god, ridiculed the priests, reviled the Vedas and sought salvation in pleasure. Their philosophy preceded Buddhism[110]. Garbe observes, "Several vestiges show that even in the pre-Buddhistic India proclaimers of purely materialistic doctrines appeared ; and there is no doubt that those doctrines had ever afterwards, as they have to-day, numerous secret followers.[111]" The germs of their thought are even found in the hymns of the Ṛgveda[112]. There are references to this philosophy in the Śāntiparva[113] and Śalyaparva[114] of the Mahābhārata. Manu[115] mentions the nāstikas (nihilists) and pāṣaṇḍas (heretics). The Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha summarises the teachings of this school of thought in its first chapter. Bāṇa in his Harṣacarita refers to the Lokāyatikas[116]. In the Kādambarī, Bāṇa observes that their teachings were promoting sinful tendencies. In the Kudlur plates of the Gaṅga king Mārasiṁha, dated 963 A.D., a famous Jaina teacher is referred

109. Radhakrishnan, IP, II, p. 251.
110. Rhys Davids, American Lectures, p. 24.
111. Garbe, PAI, p. 25.
112. Radhakrishnan, IP, I, p. 277.
113. vv. 1414 and 1430-1442.
114. v. 3619.
115. Institutes of Manu, ii, 11 ; iii. 150, 161 ; iv. 30, 61, 163 ; v. 89 ; viii. 22, 309 ; ix. 65. 66 ; xii. 33. 95. 96.
116. Bk. viii.

to as 'Lokāyata-loka-sammata-matiḥ[117], "one whose talents are appreciated by the adherents of the Lokāyata system".

Sadānanda introduces us to four schools of materialists. The concept of soul was the bone of contention. One school regarded 'the soul as identical with the gross body, another with senses, a third with breath, and a fourth with the organ of thought'[118]. The materialists laid stress on the doctrine of uncontrolled energy, self-assertion and the repudiation of all authority. They disregarded the religion centring round custom and magic. They pronounced the spiritual independence of the individual. They were emphatic to put a thing on the touchstone of reason and, according to them, nothing short of it should be accepted. Somadeva observes that, according to the Bārhaspatyas, dharmas or qualities could only exist if one could be sure of the existence of a Dharmin, 'one who possesses dharmas', *i.e.*, the Self. They did not believe in the existence of a second world. Their idea was that no body lived after death. They regarded emancipation as a myth. Dr. Radhakrishnan rightly observes, "The Cārvāka philosophy is a fanatical effort made to rid the age of the weight of the past that was oppressing it. The removal of dogmatism which it helped to effect was necessary to make room for the great constructive efforts of speculation"[119].

Jainism

Jainism had a stronghold in the South during the period under review. It enjoyed the royal patronage of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakheṭa, the Gaṅgas of Gaṅgapādi and the Cālukyas of Lemulavāḍa. Commercial classes in particular were devoted to the religion of the Arhat. The Jainas cherished the old philanthropic ideals preached by the Tīrthaṅkaras. Somadeva in his Yaśastilaka refers to the ideals of a true Jaina as devotion to Jina, good will towards all creatures, hospitality to all and altruism. He laid stress on the four gifts of protection, food, medicine and religious instruction which formed the kernel of the Jaina concept of charity. It

117. MAR, 1921, pp. 17 ff.
118. Radhakrishnan, IP, I, p. 280.
119. *Ibid.*, p. 283.

appears that during Somadeva's time a feeling of parochialism had overtaken the Jainas with regard to the distribution of charity. Somadeva says that those who did not believe in the fundamental Jaina dogmas of Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct were not fit to receive gifts and gifts made to such people would lead to evil consequences.

The Jaina View of Liberation : Somadeva's Account

The Jaina view of liberation has been described by Somadeva. He characterises mokṣa (liberation) as a state of supreme joy, knowledge, power, potency and subtleness[120]. The Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct, the Three Jewels of the Jainas, lead to salvation. Worldly bondage results from false views, lack of self-restraint and passions. False views (mithyātva) reflect in lack of faith in Āpta, Āgama and the Padārthas, error, doubt, ascribing divinity to what is not divine, adopting false vow and accepting as the truth what is not a truth at all. Lack of self-restraint results from the absence of vows, cruelty, carelessness, lack of content and subordinating oneself to the overwhelming effect of the senses. "The four passions, anger, pride, deceit and greed, with their four varieties, plunge the creatures into the sea of transmigration ; and activities connected with the mind, speech and the body, according as they are good and bad, are the factors which attach virtues and vices to the Self."[121]

Aversion to certain Hindu Practices

The Jainas made no secret of their aversion to certain religious practices of the Hindus. Practices such as sun-worship, bath during eclipses, giving away money on Saṁkrānti days, the morning and evening ablutions, fire worship, the worship of edifices, trees, stupas, jewels, conveyances, weapons, the earth, Yakṣas and mountains, bathing in rivers and the ocean on ceremonial days, offering of cooked rice, committing religious suicide by falling from a precipice, bowing at the tail of a cow and taking cow's urine[122], which were quite

120. Somadeva, Yaśastilaka, II, p. 273.
121. Handiqui, YIC, pp. 251-52.
122. Somadeva, Yaśastilaka, II, p. 282.

common with the Hindus, did not find favour with the Jainas during the early mediaeval period.

Controversy between Jainism and Śaivism

Theological controversy was common amongst different schools of thought. The relation of Jainism and Śaivism was of prime importance. Differences ranging between the two have been referred to by Somadeva. The Śaivas held that the incorporeal and quiescent Śiva was the originator of a rare *śāstra* in the form of *Nāda* or Sound[123]. The Jainas did not subscribe to the ideas of Śiva being the source of scriptural knowledge. Somadeva says that Sadāśiva could not be the expounder of a system, for he is incorporeal and this role could not be ascribed to him in his corporeal aspect because Śiva united with Pārvatī will be subject to passion. In the absence of a third alternative, it cannot be said that Śiva expounds the system by means of an external Power (Śakti), for he cannot be supposed to have any such power owing to the lack of any integral relationship between the two. Thus, the śāstras of the Śaivas are without any authoritative source[124].

Jainas repudiated Śiva as the creator of Universe

The Jainas did not accept the theory of the Śaivas that Śiva was the creator of the universe. Somadeva says that no one who created the world either by intellect or will was seen and if an invisible creator was postulated, the making of the mat could even be ascribed to him. If there was really some one to build up the universe, there would be nothing left for carpenters and others to do[125].

Question of Omniscience :

Śaiva Contention

The question of omniscience was another source of controversy between the Jainas and Śaivas. The Śaivas contended the Jaina concept that a Tīrthaṅkara or Supreme Teacher was āpta or omniscient. They held that it was difficult for a human being to be omniscient. Even if it is accepted that a

123. *Ibid.*, p. 255.
124. *Ibid.*, p. 254.
125. *Ibid.*, p. 256.

Tīrthaṅkara was omniscient, a question would crop up as to who was the teacher of that Tīrthaṅkara, for nobody can acquire knowledge all by himself without the help of a teacher. If it is said that the teacher of a Tīrthaṅkara was another Tīrthaṅkara, then who was the teacher of the latter. This process would be endless. The only way to meet the situation is to accept Sadāśiva as a teacher of a Tīrthaṅkara. There could be only one Omniscient Being (Āpta) and not a multitude of them like other creatures, and to believe that there were only twenty-four of them cannot be accepted on the touchstone of reason[126].

Somadeva's Reply

Somadeva meets the contention of the Śaivas. He says that a Tīrthaṅkara who possessed three kinds of supernatural knowledge did not require the help of a teacher[127]. It was not only with the Tīrthaṅkaras that they acquired knowledge of their own. He cites the case, with a little variation from the popular legend, of Kaṇāda who got the knowledge of the Vaiśeṣika philosophy at Vārāṇasī[128]. He holds that even the highest truths can be known by one's own efforts. It is of no use to thrust an imaginary teacher upon the Tīrthaṅkaras. With regard to their number, he says that there is nothing abnormal, for in the world there are many things which have their number, *e.g.*, lunar days, stars, planets, oceans, mountains and the rest[129].

Śiva and Śakti

The Jainas disputed the Śaiva theory of the relation of Śiva and Śakti. Somadeva says that relation between Śiva and Śakti described in the Śaiva scriptures is fictitious. The relation between the two can neither be described as saṁyoga (conjunction) nor as samavāya (inherence). Saṁyoga is possible only between two substances, according to the Yauga

126. *Ibid.*, p. 276.
127. *Ibid.*, p. 277.
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*

doctrine. Śakti or potency is not a substance and, therefore, there can be no saṁyoga between Śiva and Śakti. According to the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy, samavāya (inherence) is the permanent relation between two things which do not exist separately, as for example, a quality and the qualified. As Śakti exists and operates separately from Śiva, there can be no samavāya relationship between the two[130].

Buddhism

Buddhism was not the potential religion of the period but it wielded considerable influence over the theological discussions of the time. Its importance can fairly be gauged from the allegations of Śaṅkara's opponents that he was a Buddhist in disguise. The Buddhist theories of *Nairātmya* (non-existence of the Self) and Void (*śūnyatā*) figured prominently in the realm of theological disputes. Śāntirakṣita, who belongs to the eighth century A.D , details the theory of nairātmya[131] According to him, satvadṛṣṭi, *i.e.*, the notion of 'I' and 'mine,'' is the source of endless sufferings and the only way to get out of it is to realise nairātmya. Sufferings will end when the concept of 'I' and 'mine' will cease to exist and there will be no rebirth with the end of sufferings. Final release from the cycle of death and birth will result from the practice of bhāvanā (contemplation) based on the realisation of nairātmya. The obstacles in the way of the realisation of the truth are kleśāvaraṇa and jñeyāvaraṇa. Lust, hatred and delusion constitute the first and they obstruct the vision of the truth. The second consists in the inability to comprehend and recognise the nature of the true and the false. The realisation of nairātmya will put an end to kleśāvaraṇa. Constant and fervent cultivation, ranging over a long period, of the principle of nairātmya will remove jñeyāvaraṇa.

According to another school of Buddhist thought, *viz.*, the Mādhyamika theory of Void (*Śūnyatā*), final release is the realisation of *śunyatā* which reflects in the cessation of the complex of worldly notions called *prapañca*[132]. The Mādhyamika

130 *Ibid.*
131. Tatvasaṁgraha, vv. 3488 ff.
132 Candrakīrti on Mādhyamakakārikā 18 5.

theory of void (*śūnyatā*) formed an important subject of *discussion during this period. The theme of the doctrine is* that 'śūnyatā is nothing but the law of causation known as pratītya-samutpāda, that is, whatever is subject to cause and condition is really unborn, has no real origination, and is hence called *śūnya* or void[133]. 'All objects have only a relative existence like a mirage or a magic shows or a dream'. The theory of śūnya has assumed its name of madhyamaka or the middle doctrine, for it purports to avoid the two extremes of existence and non-existence[134]. The doctrine is to be realised in one's heart, for it is beyond comprehension and cannot be explained by speech.

133. Madhyamakakārikā 24. 18.
134. *Ibid*, 15. 10.

SOURCES

Epigraphs

Inscriptions of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Gurjaratrā

Jodhpur stone inscription, V.S. 894=837 A.D., EI, XVIII, pp. 87-99 ; JRAS, 1894, pp. 1-9.

Ghatiyala stone inscription, V.S. 918=861 A.D., JRAS, 1895, pp. 513-21.

Inscriptions of the Gurjara-Pratihāras of Bhṛgukaccha

Dadda I

Sankheda Copperplate, (K.E.) 346 (expired)=595—96 A.D., EI, II, p. 19.

Dadda II

Umeta grant, Ś.S. 400=477-78 A.D. or 478-79, IA, VII, pp. 61-66.

Bagumra grant, Ś.S. 415=492-93 A.D. or 493-94, IA, XVII, p. 183.

Ilao grant, Ś S. 417=494-95 A.D. or 495-96, IA, XIII, pp. 115-19 ; JBBRAS, X, p. 19.

Two grants of Dadda Praśāntarāga, EI, V. pp. 37-41.

Kaira Copperplate Charter, (K.E.) 380=629 A.D., IA, XIII, pp. 81-87.

Kaira Copperplate Charter, (K.E.) 385=634 A.D., IA, XIII, pp. 88-91.

Sankheda Copperplate, (K.E.) 391 (expired)=641 A.D., EI, II, p. 20.

Jayabhata III

Nausari Copperplate, (K.E.) 456 (expired)=706 A.D., IA, XIII, pp. 70-81.

Kavi Copperplate, (K E.) 486 (expired)=736 A.D., IA, V, pp. 109-115.

Inscriptions of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras of Kānyakubja

Osia inscription, JRAS, 1907, p. 1010.

Buchkala stone inscription, V.S. 872=815 A.D., EI, IX, pp. 198-200.

Barah copperplate inscription, V.S. 893=836 A.D., EI, XIX, pp. 15-19.

Daulatpur (Jodhpur) copperplate inscription, V.S. 900=843 A.D., EI, V, pp. 208-13.

Deogarh (Lalitpur, Jhansi) stone inscription, V.S. 919=862 A.D., EI, IV, pp. 309-10.

Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin (Gwalior) temple stone inscription, V.S. 932=875 A.D., EI, I, pp. 154-62.

Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin (Gwalior) temple stone inscription, V.S. 933=876 A.D., EI, I, pp. 154-62.

Pehoa (Karnal district) stone inscription, Harṣa Saṁvat, 276=882 A.D., EI, I, pp. 184-90.

Gwalior (Sāgar-tal) stone inscription, EI, XVIII, pp. 99-114.

Ahar (Bulandshahr district) stone inscription, Harṣa Saṁvat 259 (it gives other dates also)=865 A.D., EI, XIX, pp. 52-62.

Pāṇḍava-kā-kilā (Delhi) stone inscription, Annual Report, Rajputana Museum, 1923-24, p. 3.

Barton Museum(Bhavanagar) fragmentary stone inscription, EI, XIX, pp. 174-77.

Una (Junagadh, Kathiawad) copperplate inscription, No. I, Valabhī Saṁvat 574=893 A.D., EI, IX, pp. 1-6.

Dighwa-Dubauli (Saran district, Bihar) copperplate inscription, V.S. 955=898 A.D., IA, XV, pp. 105-13.

Una copperplate inscription, No. II, V.S. 956=899 A.D., EI, IX, pp. 6-10.

Siyadoni (Gwalior) stone inscription, V.S. 960=903 A.D., EI, I, pp. 162, 179.

Siyadoni (Gwalior) stone inscription, V.S. 964=907 A.D., EI, pp. 162-79.

Pehoa (Karnal district, Punjab) stone inscription, EI, II, pp. 242-50.

British Museum stone inscription, Regnal year 2, EI, V, Appendix, p. 47, note 5.

Paharpur stone inscription, Regnal year 5, noticed in ARASI, 1925-26, p. 141.

British Museum stone inscription, Regnal year 6, EI, V, Appendix, p. 47, note 5.

Itkhori stone image inscription, ARASI, 1920-21, p. 35.

Ramgaya stone inscription, Regnal year 8, MASB, V, No. 3, p. 64 ; IA, 1918, pp. 109-11.

Guneriya stone inscription, Regnal year 9, ASIR, III, p. 124 ; IA, 1918, p. 110.

Haddala copperplate inscription, Ś.S. 836=914 A.D., IA, XII, pp. 190-95 ; *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 90.

Asni stone inscription, V.S. 974=917 A.D., IA, XVI, pp. 173-75.

Bengal Asiatic Society's copperplate, V.S. 988=931 A.D., IA, XV, pp. 138-41.

Rakhetra stone inscription, V.S. 999-1000=942-43 A.D., ARASI, 1924-25, p. 168.

Partabgarh stone inscription, V.S. 1003=946 A.D., EI, XIV, pp. 176-88.

Siyadoni (Gwalior) stone inscription, V.S. 1005=948 A.D., EI, I, pp. 162-79.

Rajorgarh stone inscription, V.S. 1016=959 A.D., EI, III, pp. 263-67.

Jhusi copperplate inscription, V.S. 1084=1027 A.D., IA, XVIII, pp. 33-35.

Kara stone inscription, V.S. 1093=1036 A.D., JRAS, 1927, pp. 692-95.

Inscriptions of the Pālas

Khalimpur copperplate of Dharmapāla, Regnal year 32, EI, IV, pp. 243-54.

Monghyr copperplate inscription of Devapāla, Regnal year 33, EI, XVIII, pp. 304-07.

Bhagalpur copperplate inscription of Nārāyaṇapāla, Regnal year 17, IA, XV, pp. 304-10.

Badal pillar inscription of Guruva Mishra, EI, II, pp. 160-67.

Baragaon pillar inscription of Rājyapāla, Regnal year 24, IA, XLVII, 1917, p. 111.

Baragaon or Nālandā stone image inscription of Gopāla II, Regnal year 1, JASB, 1908, NS, IV, pp. 105-06.

Bodhgaya inscription of Gopāla II, IA, XXXVIII, p. 237.

Inscriptions of the Cāhamānas

Hansot plates of Bhartṛvaddha II, V.S. 813=756 A.D., EI, XII, pp. 177-204.

Harṣa stone inscription of Vigraharāja II, V.S. 1030=973 A.D., EI, II, pp. 116-30.

Inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas

Samangad plates of Dantidurga, Ś.S. 675=754 A.D., IA, XI, p. 108.

Ellora Daśāvatāra cave inscription, ASI, Wc, V, pp. 88 ff.

Wani copperplate inscription of Govinda III, Ś.S. 730=808 A.D., IA, IX, pp. 156-63.

Radhanpur copperplates of Govinda III, Ś.S. 730=808 A.D., EI, VI, pp. 239-51.

Baroda copperplate inscription of Karkarāja, Ś.S. 734=812 A.D., IA, XII, pp. 156-65.

Pathari pillar inscription of Parabala, V.S. 917=860 A.D., EI, IX, pp. 248-56 ; IA, 1911, pp. 239-40.

Nilgund inscription of Amoghavarṣa I, Ś.S. 788=866 A.D., EI, VI, pp. 98-108.

Bagumra copperplate inscription of Dhruvarāja, Ś.S. 789=867 A.D., IA, XII, pp. 179-90.

Sanjan copperplates of Amoghavarṣa I, Ś.S. 793=871 A.D., EI, XVIII, pp. 235-57.

Bagumra plates of Kṛṣṇa (of the Gujarat Branch), Ś.S. 810=888 A.D., IA, XIII, pp. 66 ff.

Bagumra plates of Indra III, Ś.S. 836=915 A.D., EI, IX, pp. 24-41.

Cambay copperplate inscription of Govinda IV, Ś.S. 852=930 A.D., EI, VII, pp. 26-47.

Deoli plates of Kṛṣṇa III, Ś.S. 862=940 A.D., EI, V, pp. 192 ff.

Jura inscription of Kṛṣṇa III, EI, XIX, pp. 287—90.

Karhad copperplates of Kṛṣṇa III, Ś.S. 880=959 A.D., EI, IV, pp. 278 ff.

Karda grant of Kakka II, Ś.S. 894=972 A.D., IA, XII, pp. 263-70.

Inscriptions of the Candellas

Khajuraho stone inscription, No. I, of Harṣadeva, EI, I, pp. 121-22.

Khajuraho stone inscription, No. II, of Dhaṅga, V.S. 1011=954 A.D., EI, I, pp. 122-35.

Khajuraho stone inscription of Dhaṅga, V.S. 1059=1002 A.D., EI, I, pp. 137-47.

Mhow (Mau) stone inscription of Madanavarmadeva, EI, I, pp. 195-207.

Mahoba Jain image-inscription of Madanavarmadeva, V.S. 1211=1154-55 A.D., EI, I, pp. 217-22.

Inscription of the Cālukyas

Aihole inscription of Pulakeśi II, Ś.S. 556=634-35 A.D., IA, VIII, pp. 237-45.

Inscription of the Guhilots

Catsu inscription of Bālāditya, EI, XII, pp. 10-17.

Inscriptions of the Kalacuris

Bilhari stone inscription of Yuvarājadeva II, EI, I, pp. 251-70.

Banaras grant of Karṇadeva, K.E. 793=1042 A.D., EI, II, pp. 297-310.

Goharwa plates of Karṇadeva, EI, XI, pp. 139-46.

Kahla copperplate inscription of Soḍhadeva, V.S. 1134=1077 A.D., EI, VII, pp. 85-93.

Amoda plates of Pṛthvīdeva I, Cedi Saṁvat 831=1079-80, A.D., EI, XIX, pp. 75-81.

Inscriptions of the Kacchapaghātas

Sāsbahū temple inscription of Mahīpāla, V.S. 1150=1093 A.D., IA, XV, pp. 33-46.

Dubkund stone inscription of Vikramasiṁha, V.S. 1145=1088 A.D., EI, II, pp. 232-40.

Inscription of the Paramaras

Udaipur Praśasti, EI, I, pp. 222-38.

Works on Numismatics

Cunningham, Coins of Mediaeval India, London, 1893.

V.A. Smith, Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Oxford, 1906.

Wright, Catalogue of Coins of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Vols. I and II.

Accounts of the Muslim Travellers

Alberūnī's India, English translation by E.C. Sachau, London, 1914.

Al Bilādurī, Futūhu-l Buldān, Elliot, HI, I, pp. 113-30.

Al Mas'ūdi, Mur ūj-ul-Zahab, Elliot, HI, I, pp. 18-25.

Al Idrīsī, Nuzhatu-l Mushtāk, Elliot, HI, I, pp. 74-93.

Al Utbī, Tārikh-i-Yamīnī or Kitābul-yamīnī, Elliot, HI, II, pp. 14-52.

Ibn Khurdādba, Kitābu-l Masālik wa-l Mamālik, Elliot, HI, I, pp. 12-17.

Ibn-ul-Asir, Kamil-ut-Tawārīkh or Tārikhul-kamil, ed. by Buluk, 1874.

Khond Mīr, Habīb-us-Siyar, Elliot, HI, IV, pp. 154-212.

Mīr Khond, Rauzat-us-Safā, Elliot, HI, V, pp. 127-40.

Nizāmuddin, *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, English translation by* B. De.

Salsilatu-t Tawārīkh of the Merchant Sulaimān, Elliot, HI, I, pp. 3-7 ; Sulaimān Saudāgar, Hindi translation, published by the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā, Banaras, 1922.

Tarīkh-i-Firishtā (Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India), English translation by John Briggs.

Sanskrit Works

Bāṇa, Harṣacarita, English translation by Cowell and Thomas, London, 1897.

Bāṇa, Kādambarī, ed. by Parab, Bombay, 1896.
Caṇḍeśvara, Vivādaratnākara, BIS, Calcutta.
Devalasmṛti.
Hemacandra, Kumārapālacarita, ed. by S.P. Pandit. Bomb. 1900.
Hemacandra, Kāvyānuśāsanaviveka.
Hemacandra, Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi, ed. by Boehtlingk.
Harivaṁśa
Keśava, Kalpadrukoṣa, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, XLII, 1928.
Kāmandikīya Nītisāra, ed. by Gaṇapati Śāstrī. Trivandrum, 1912.
Kalhaṇa, Rājataraṅgiṇī, ed. by Durga Prasad. Bomb., 1892.
Kalhaṇa, Rājataraṅgiṇī, English translation by Sir Aurel Stein. London, 1900.
Kalhaṇa, Rājataraṅgiṇī, English translation by R.S. Pandit.
Kānyakubja Mahākāvya.
Manusmṛti, (Hindi Pustaka Agency). Cal., 1928.
Medhātithi on Manu, English translation by Ganganath Jha.
Merutuṅga, Prabandhacintāmaṇi, ed. by Ramacandra Dinanatha. Bomb., 1888.
———, Prabandhacintāmaṇi, English translation by C.H. Tawney. Cal., 1889.
Nāradasmṛti, ed. by Dr. Jolly, BIS, Cal.
Nityācārapradīpa, BIS, Cal.
Pṛthvīrājavijaya, ed. by S.K. Belvalkar.
Pañcatantra
Padmagupta, Navasāhasāṅkacarita, ed. by V.S. Islampurkar. Bomb. Sanskrit Series, Bomb., 1895.
Pampa, Vikramārjunavijaya or Pampa-Bhārata, ed. by Lewis Rice. Bangalore, 1898.
Prabhāvakacarita, ed. by H.M. Sarma. Bomb., 1909.
Pratāparudradeva, Sarasvatīvilāsa, Mysore ed.
Rājaśekhara, Bālarāmāyaṇa, ed. by Govindadeva Śāstrī, Banaras, 1896.
———, Bālabhārata or Pracaṇḍapāṇḍava, ed. by Durga Prasad and Kashinath Pandurang Parab. Bomb., 1887.

Rājaśekhara, Kāvyamīmāṁsā, ed. by C.D. Dalal and R.A.K. Śāstrī, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. I, 1916.
Skanda Purāṇa.
Somadeva, Yaśastilaka. Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Bomb.
Trikāṇḍamaṇḍana, Āpastambasūtradhvanitārtha-kārikā, BIS, Cal.
Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa, ed. by Hemcandra Bhattacarya. Cal.
Vijñāneśvara, Mitakṣarā on Yājñavalkyasmṛti.
Viśvarūpa, Bālakrīḍā, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.
Vyāsasmṛti
Yājñavalkyasmṛti

Prākṛt Works

Rājaśekhara, Karpūramañjari, ed. by Durga Prasad and Kashinath Pandurang Parab.
——, Karpūramañjarī, ed. by Konow and Lanman. Harvard Oriental Series, 1901.
——, Viddhaśālabhañjikā, ed. by B.R. Arte, Poona, 1886.
Udyotana, Kuvalayamāla

Chinese Works

Beal, S., Hwui-li's Life of Yuan Chwang. London, 1911.
Takakusu, I-tsing's Record of Buddhist Religion in India and the Malaya Archipelago, Oxford, 1896.
Watters, T., On Yuan Chwang (Si-yu-ki), 1904.

Work in Rājasthānī

Pṛthvīrāja-Rāso, ed. by S.S. Das. Banaras, 1904.

Modern Works

Altekar, A.S., The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times, Poona, 1934.
Banerjee, R.D., Bāṅgālār Itihāsa (Bengali).
Basak, R.G., History of North-Eastern India, Cal., 1934.
Bhandarkar, D.R., Gurjaras.

Bhandarkar, R.G., Early History of the Deccan, 3rd ed., Cal., 1928.

Bose, N.S., History of the Candellas.

Fleet, J.F., Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, Bomb., 1899.

Ganguly, D.C., History of the Paramāra Dynasty, Dacca, 1933.

Haig, Woolsey, (ed.), Cambridge History of India, III, Cambridge, 1928.

Majumdar, R.C., (ed.), The Classical Age.

———, *The Age of Imperial Kanauj.*

Munshi, K.M., The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa, Vol. III.

Ojha, G.H., Rājpūtāne kā Itihāsa (Hindi).

Pandey, A.B., Early Mediaeval India.

Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan.

Ray, H.C., Dynastic History of Northern India, Vols. I-II.

Sharma, D., Early Cauhān Dynasties.

Sharma, R.Ś., Śūdras in Ancient India.

Smith, V.A., Early History of India.

Tod, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. by Crooke, Oxford, 1920.

Tripathi, R.S , *History of Kanauj to the Moslem Conquest,* Banaras, 1937.

Vaidya, C.V., History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Vols. I—III.

Works on Polity and Administration

Altekar, A.S., State and Government in Ancient India.

Dikshitar, V.R., Hindu *Administrative Institutions.*

Ghoshal, U.N., Hindu Revenue System.

Law, N.N., Inter-State Relations in Ancient India.

Vishvanathan, S.A., *International Law in Ancient India.*

Works on Civilization and Religion

Altekar, A.S., The Position of Women in Ancient India.

Dutta, R.C., History of Civilization in Ancient India.

Farquhar, An Outline of Religious Literature of India.

Hopkins, Religions of India.

Indra, M.A., Status of Women in Ancient India.

Macnicol, Nicol, Indian Theism, from the Vedic to the Muhammadan Period.

Pinkham, M.W., Woman in the Sacred Scriptures of Hinduism.

Stevenson, S.S. (Mrs.), The Heart of Jainism.

Thomas, P., Women and Mârriage in India.

Valavalkar, P.H., Hindu Social Institutions.

Gazetteers

Bombay Gazetteer, Vols. I-II.

Gazetteer of Farrukhabad.

Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vols. VI & XIV.

Journals

ABORI, Vols. XXXI, XXXIII, XXXVII, XL.

IA, XVI ; 1919 ; LVII.

IHQ, 1933.

JBBRAS, XXII.

JDL, X.

JIH, XXII, XXIII.

JRAS, 1904, 1905, 1909, pt. I.

JUG, III, IV, VI, VIII, X, XI, XII.

Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, XXII Session, Gauhati, 1959.

INDEX

F

G

N

O

P

T

W

Y